TRANSCRIPT
OF THE PUBLIC MEETING
JULY 25, 2002
AT THE COASTAL INN
SAINT JOHN

TO DISCUSS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE NB POWER COLESON COVE GENERATING STATION REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

Prepared by:
Department of Environment & Local Government

New Nouveau Brunswick

Environment and Local Government

JULY 25, 2002
7 P.M.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Good evening. I am pleased to welcome you on behalf of the Minister of the Environment and Local Government, to this first meeting of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the NB Power Coleson Cove Refurbishment Project.

Bonsoir, je souhaite la bienvenue à tout de monde de la part de la Ministre de l'Environnement et des Gouvernements locaux. Ceci est la première réunion sur l'étude d'impact sur l'environnement par rapport au projet de remise à neuf de la centrale de Coleson Cove d'Énergie Nouveau-Brunswick.

My name is Emery Goguen and I'll be chairing tonight's meeting. The Minister has called this public meeting, as required under the province's Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation, to provide interested members of the public an opportunity to discuss the EIA Report prepared by NB Power. There will be a second meeting, which will be held at the Lorneville Community Centre on Tuesday, July 30 beginning at 7:00 p.m.

My role this evening is to ensure that this be an orderly meeting, and to make sure that the discussions themselves take place in an atmosphere where everyone who wishes to make a point, or make a comment, or ask questions will be given the opportunity to do so. I personally live in Bathurst, and I am not employed by the Department of the Environment and Local Government who administers the legislation or by the proponent, NB Power, of this project. So I'm here simply to Chair the meeting.

The Environmental Impact Assessment has been prepared for NB Power by a consultant. That report has been reviewed by a technical committee made up of representatives of various federal, municipal and provincial agencies. A General Review Statement has been produced as a result of that review.

In addition, the Department of the Environment and Local Government has produced a summary of the main report, to assist members of the public in becoming familiar with its main points. These documents have been made available to local residents in the last few weeks and copies are also available on the side of the room here.

I'd now like to begin by introducing the individuals who are seated with me this evening.

On my left are representatives of the Department of the Environment and Local Government. Perry Haines, my immediate left here… is the Director of the Project Assessment Branch of the Department...and Germaine Pataki-Theriault, a Project Manager in the Project Assessment Branch, and is the Chairperson of the Technical Review Committee which has reviewed the Environmental Impact Assessment study and she prepared the General Review Statement as well. On my right are representatives of NB Power, which in this case, is the proponent in the Assessment. Charles Hickman is the Manager of Environmental Assessment and Assurance and he assures me that that means he is the Compliance Officer, ….next is Gaetan Thomas, who is the Project Director… that means he oversees the Coleson Cove Refurbishment Project, then there is Greg Gillis, who is the Senior Consultant with AMEC …did I say that correctly? Also in attendance are some of the representatives from the various agencies who reviewed the EIA study, and who have produced the general review statement. They are here to answer questions you may have which might relate to their own area of responsibility. If there are appropriate questions for these people, they'll be referred to them as needed.

Before we go any further, I'd like to mention that we have received the names of individuals who wish to make a presentation tonight. Anyone else who might want to make a formal presentation should approach one of the public consultation staff on my left here, on the side of the room, in order to have their names added to the list. We will be proceeding in order of the list that has been produced in order of that flip chart that's to the rear. These people are also here to assist you if you need documents or have process-related questions.

Also, in an effort to allow everyone an opportunity to speak, we will try to keep individual comments/questions to 15 minutes each. However, there will be ample opportunity to approach the microphone more than once if it's needed.

I will be calling on the presenters according to the order on the list, and allowing time in between for questions or comments from others until approximately 8:00 or 9 p.m….8 or 8:30. I'll then open the discussion for general comments and questions until approximately 8:30 at which time we will have a few-minutes coffee break. After the break we will resume with presentations, followed by comments and questions from the floor. Our aim is to adjourn this meeting at 10:30 but we are prepared to stay late or as required to hear from everyone.

I'd also like to note that simultaneous interpretation services are available and if you wish to use it, headphones are available at the back of the room. The proceedings are also being recorded in order to prepare transcripts and a Summary of Public Consultation for presentation to the Minister. So, I'd ask that you identify yourselves as you approach the microphone. I would also ask you to avoid speaking too quickly, like I have been doing, in order to assist the interpreters.

Je veux noter qu'il y a disponible ce soir un service de traduction simultanée. Ceux qui veulent s'en servir doivent ce procurer un écouteur disponible en arrière de cette salle. Aussi tous les paroles ce soir seront enregistrées afin de pourvoir préparer un procès verbal détaillé. S'il vous plait servez-vous des micros et s'il vous plait identifiez vous et ne parlez pas trop vite.I should confirm that this is a non-smoking venue and would ask that you comply with this requirement. The rest rooms are located towards the elevators ...the back of the room...in the hallway...

So now we will begin the meeting with brief introductory remarks from NB Power...is that you Gaetan? O.K.

GAETAN THOMAS

Good evening... What are the drivers for the project? We're proposing a refurbishment of the Coleson Cove Generating Station. Number One...we need a Reliable Supply of Energy. Coleson Cove represents a 1000 MW of reliable energy for the Province of New Brunswick....and we require it for in-Province requirement especially during the winter.

Number Two...we are required to improve environmental performance. You're all aware that we had an Eastern Canadian Premier and New England Governor's requirement to reduce NO_x by 2007 and 2010 for SO_2 and we also have to have a plan in place by 2005 to reduce the emission of SO_2 at Coleson Cove down to 40,000 tonnes.

Number Three...we want to maintain stable energy rates for our customers.

What is the project all about? We are going to reduce sulphur dioxide, NO_x, and particulate emissions to meet the environmental requirements. The fuel savings are sufficient to finance all of the environmental upgrades. And, we plan to convert all three units from heavy fuel oil, bunker seed, to Orimulsion®. The estimated cost of the project is $750 million. The schedule calls for the project to be completed by November 2004 and we will extend the plant life to 2030.

The main component of the environmental upgrade is environmental equipment. We're installing a scrubber to reduce the sulphur dioxide emissions,... a wet electrostatic precipitator, to reduce fine particulate emissions, including the vanadium, sulphur trioxide and we're doing major boiler modifications, which includes a complete change over of the combustion equipment, the introduction of low NO_x burners, reburn system to allow fuel switching and to control our NO_x emissions. If you look at the plant here we have the three existing boilers and the existing dry precipitators....and this is the equipment we plan to add....the scrubber, the wet precipitator will be on top of the scrubber and a new stack...600 foot tall.

A project like this requires a lot of external contracts so the first critical one is the contract with the fuel supplier for Orimulsion®, which is Bitor. We also...for this contract it's a 20 year term we're talking about...the contract for Irving Oil for unloading and fuel delivery...that includes the pipeline, maintenance ...and they have been operating a safe monobuoy at Canaport for the last 25 years plus. And, we also need a supply of limestone that will mix with water to remove the sulphur dioxide in the scrubber...and, obviously the sale of gypsum that we plan to recycle like we've been successfully doing in Dalhousie and Belledune.

As part of the EIA process, we started about 13-14 months ago meeting with the people. We had a number of meetings; we had a number of consultations with the various stakeholders. We had over...almost 1000 people that we met at different times. We received guidelines from the Department of Environment and Local Government with respect to what would be required to be studied and we adjusted our studies and our design to meet the concerns that were raised throughout the process.

So a quick summary of the studies...the first one...the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment...we compared the heavy fuel oil with the Orimulsion®...what are the risks in the Bay of Fundy. We also did an Air Quality Study. We did a Surface Water Study to ensure that there was enough water and the City and the study indicates there is plenty of water for the scrubber operation. We did a Socioeconomic Study, which basically we are maintaining over a 100 permanent jobs and we are also creating employment during construction...between 6 and 700 people. We also went into a quite detailed Human Health Risk Assessment Study. We studied the impact of all the particulates, fine particulates. We did a study for the Solid Waste Disposal...that is for potential landfill for some gypsum. We also did a study on the Fuel

Delivery System, including the integrity of the existing pipeline, which is deemed to be suitable for the extension of the project. And, we also did some Transportation studies for the vehicle traffic during construction and noise generated as a result of work around the pipeline and also with the transportation of limestone and gypsum.

Now the emissions improvement…what we're talking about here is on the sulphur dioxide…you know with the scrubber we will improve our emissions down by 77% or better. For the nitrogen oxide, we're looking at controlling these emissions with a reburn system and there will be improvement down from 0.7 to 2.1…which is a reduction of 70% or better. And, for the particulate, all particulates, fine…they will be improved by 75% or better. So, the report conclusions are very positive. We have a major reduction in emissions…SO_2, NO_x, particulate. We have as a result of that…improved air quality in the air shed…which, in line with the Human Health Risk Assessment…they are all benefits to the general public's health.

The detailed study we did on the Bay of Fundy, clearly demonstrates a probability and lower consequence of the ecological effects if we had a spill. The risk to the Bay of Fundy marine environment, which is critical, is certainly improved…And, obviously positive effect of the local and provincial economies. So when we come back to the drivers…there are three major benefits. We are able to reach these environmental improvements. We do it to maintain a reliable supply of energy at 1000 MW is critical to our in-province customers and we are able to do it at a stable energy price for our customers.

Thank you very much for your attention.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Mr. Thomas. Next I'll ask Perry Haines of the Department of Environment and Local Government to make some introductory remarks.

PERRY HAINES

Good Evening ….all I'd like to do is just welcome everybody here this evening and encourage everyone to ask their questions and get their comments on record. We have a significant number of mikes around the room and we'd encourage people to participate here tonight. This is your process. This is the public's process of this overall EIA process for this project. And, we certainly encourage everybody to take advantage of that. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Next is Germaine Pataki-Theriault, also of the Department.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THERIAULT

Thank you. I'm here to discuss a little bit about the process for the Environmental Impact Assessment. The Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation requires that all electrical power generating facilities with a production rating of greater than 3 Mega Watts (MW) or any modification to those facilities undergo or become registered with the Department of Environment and Local Government and approved prior to commencing the project or the modifications. Exactly one year ago today, July 25th was when NB Power submitted a request to refurbish Coleson Cove Generating Station to burn Orimulsion® fuel. A committee of technical experts from various federal, provincial and municipal agencies was sent the registration information for an initial review. A host of questions was sent back to the proponent, answers were provided and further review ensued. It was determined on Halloween, October 31st that full environmental Impact Assessment was required for this project.

When a project is required to undergo a full Environmental Impact Assessment or EIA as we call it, a group of technical representatives is established to assist the process. The duties of the Technical Review Committee include identifying significant issues for the study, recommending study guidelines for the EIA and reviewing the report. The review committee for this project included many people: members of the New Brunswick Department of Environment and Local Government, Natural Resources and Energy, Health and Wellness, Agriculture, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Transportation, the Sports and Culture Secretariat and the Workers Health, Safety and Compensation Commission, as well as, the City of Saint John, the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Environment Canada, Transport Canada, the Saint John Port Authority and the Atlantic Pilotage Authority. Draft Guidelines were released to the public for their input on November 15th.

Issues of concern included: air quality impacts, management of greenhouse gases, examination of alternatives, potential impacts of a spill in the Bay of Fundy, increased marine vessel traffic, the integrity of the existing pipeline from Coleson Cove to the Refinery, noise, air and safety impacts from increased vehicle traffic, potential impacts to the terrestrial environment and adequacy of the water supply at Spruce Lake. The public's comments on the Guidelines were received until December 15th. Many of the concerns were similar to those of members on the Review Committee, but new and very good public suggestions for the guidelines included an analysis of impact on human health, ensuring the endangered Right Whale was considered in the analysis of hypothetical spill…I have two analyses here…the hypothetical spill analysis, ensuring a broader analysis of alternatives and ensuring that upset conditions were included in the air quality analysis. The Final Guidelines with the public's input were issued to NB Power on January 15th.

Subsequent to the Final Guidelines being issued, Terms of Reference were produced by NB Power detailing the approach to be used by the Study Team during its investigations. Nine component studies were submitted to the Technical Review Committee in support of the EIA report. These were received between February 28th and April 12th. The first Draft EIA Report was submitted on April 5th. As a result of deficiencies noted by the Technical Review Committee the report has been revised in order to satisfy the Guidelines. The Technical Review Committee has concluded that the revised document submitted by NB Power addresses the issues identified by the Minister in the Guidelines and is therefore a satisfactory study on which to base public discussion of this Project. That is the purpose of this meeting tonight.

A number of technical issues regarding design, construction, operation and spill response contingency planning remain to be resolved. The Committee feels these issues may be addressed in subsequent regulatory approval processes or as conditions to be applied to the Project as part of the final decision of the Lieutenant Governor of Council, if the Government of New Brunswick approves the Project.

The Technical Review Committee generally agrees with the findings of the Report. There are some uncertainties inherent in risk assessment and modelling, but that is the nature of Environmental Assessment. It is a predictive tool used to make a decision and the follow-up is critical to ensuring the predictions are verified. In summary, the Committee feels the Project could be constructed and operated in an environmentally acceptable manner provided all mitigation measures recommended in the report are incorporated into the Project. NB Power has provided the public with a number of opportunities to provide input. These have been meetings to solicit advice into the design of some of the component studies and others to discuss the results of the report. The formal EIA process is now in its second phase – in the regulated public consultation phase. These public meetings provide you the public with opportunities to seek clarifications, ask questions or just have your input documented for the public record. A further 15 days following the last public meeting is offered to the public to submit further written comments to the Minister. A Summary of Public Participation will be prepared, including summary of the written briefs submitted to the Minister and a transcript of these meetings. This summary and the transcripts will be made publicly available. The Summary of Public Participation will be included in the documentation sent to Cabinet for the decision making process. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much Miss Pataki-Theriault and Mr. Haines. Before we begin with the formal briefs, I would like to emphasize again that everyone is welcome to participate in these proceedings. It's not necessary to make a formal presentation. All you need to do is approach the microphone and identify yourself, ask your questions, make your comments, whatever. We'll do it in an orderly fashion, but we want to make sure that everyone has an opportunity to have their say. So having said that, the first presenter is David Coon of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick. Mr Coon are you ready? O.K. Not quite?.........so programming has been temporarily interrupted due to technical difficulties? We will get back on.

DAVID COON

That's good I learned something else today…how to make a table on this thing and how to …whatever he said…turn the output screen. Good evening. I'm David Coon with the Conservation Council of New Brunswick and we want to provide some comment on the EIA and the Project. It's interesting that among the drivers that were presented in NB Power's presentation this morning…or in the beginning of the meeting this evening is reduce sulphur dioxide requirements, the Governors and Premiers requirements to reduce NO_x, but he didn't mention that they are also the Governors and Premiers requirements to reduce carbon dioxide – greenhouse gas emissions by to 1990 levels by 2010 and 10% below 1990 levels by 2020. So that's the other driver we need to think about in reviewing this project.

Why are we here? The province's Technical Review Committee has apparently already signed off on the Project. It says that "the Technical Review Committee generally agrees that the Project could be constructed and operated in an environmental acceptable manner. It seemed to me in the past with Environmental Impact Assessment meetings, the Technical Review Committee reviewed the EIA and raised issues, but drew no conclusions until the public input process was completed. I guess things have changed a little bit over the years…perhaps that could be something to consider for future meetings.

Well what has the Technical Review Committee signed off on? They have signed off on: massive greenhouse gas pollution; they've signed off on ultra fine particulates; they've signed off on toxic metals until 2030…because an integral part of this project it the life extension of that plant. The Environmental Impact Assessment did not look at the impacts of extending this plant through to 2030 beyond its current operating life to 2017, in terms of the additional environmental impacts that would result, as opposed to doing some alternative project at the end of Coleson Cove's life roughly 2017.

So we're talking about many more years of massive greenhouse gas emissions than would otherwise would happen. The release of ultra fine particulates, ongoing sulphur dioxide emission, albeit at considerably lower levels, sulphur trioxide emissions. By times periodically, we're not sure how often…a purple haze over Saint John depending on the wind or in the other direction depending on the winds, which we've seen in Dalhousie. Ongoing vanadium and nickel pollution. The massive quarrying of limestone to supply the scrubber, creation of the toxic metal waste would have to be dealt with as is the case now…will continue, the establishment of an industrial landfill on site beyond what's there…and more. Potential Orimulsion® leaks from Canaport to Coleson Cove, from the pipeline…we'll talk more about that at the meeting in the next week …because they've done some research there that has produced some interesting results. And, the risk of course of a major Orimulsion® spill in the Bay of Fundy. Obviously, there's a risk of a major oil spill from shipping oil and that shift to the impacts of Orimulsion® , which we'll also talk more about next week in terms of the marine environment and periodic spillage at the Canaport Monobuoy.

This is unacceptable to the Conservation Council, to our bio-sphere and to promoting health and wellness in Southern New Brunswick. Can argue Coleson Cove conversion equals pollution profits. Cheap, dirty fuel increases profitability from American exports for Coleson Cove investors, whoever they may be or the new owners…because as we know government has said they're not going to back any borrowing for the $750 million project. NB Power is going to have to find investors or sell the plant.

We're talking about power for export. We keep the pollution; the Americans get the power or at least a good chunk of it. According to evidence presented at the Coleson Cove hearings before the Public Utilities Board, 62% of the power generated at Coleson Cove in a normal operating year following conversion is to be sold outside of New Brunswick…62%. Translates into 62% of the pollution of Coleson Cove will be accounted for from sales outside of New Brunswick.

I might add that the Conservation Council was a major intervener, an active intervener at the Coleson Cove public hearings with the Public Utilities Board. They are however, the economic regulator and only deal with economic issues. They are not the environmental regulator. Today we're before the environment regulator and unfortunately the environment regulator doesn't have the same kind of process, which the economic regulator does. Which means evidence filed under oath with the ability for cross examination, the ability for rebuttal, the ability for argument…and so-on and so forth. The kind of process where everything gets well aired and examined to allow the environmental regulator if it happened in this case to make a proper judgement as is the case with the economic regulator.

Well what kind of pollution keeps the lights on and the buildings cool in New England? It's interesting, the quantity of particulate emissions produced by the combustion of Orimulsion® is greater than from fuel oil, which is before pollution controls…flyash is very fine, 80% less than one micron. Who says that? Well, that's according to an author that works for the company that produces the, sells the Orimulsion® and an author from Babcock & Wilcox that among other things the boiler maker presented in a paper at the CEPSI Conference in 96 in Malaysia.

Another interesting thing with respect to these ultra fine particles, the Parliamentary Office of Science & Technology requested that the House of Commons in Britain looked into the issue of particulates with respect to Orimulsion® and precipitators put in place and concluded that uncertainties remain on how well they (meaning precipitators wet and dry) can remove ultra fine particles, which are implicated in respiratory disease. The reference is there and I'll provide a hard copy to the Environment Department people so they've got the references.

Then this issue of purple haze that I mentioned... Now, this is a quote: "sulphur dioxide to sulphur trioxide conversion is promoted in an Orimulsion® fired unit due to the catalysis effect of vanadium. The conversion is evidence by a bluish plume emitted from the stack. Well, what we've seen in Dalhousie, it looks more purple...maybe it's the local atmosphere up there but anyways. That is also from the paper authored by the gentleman from Babcock and Wilcox and from the company that sells Orimulsion® presented at that same conference.

What about toxic metals? Orimulsion® has a lower calorific value than heavy fuel oil...that is you get less energy out of it when you burn it in equal amounts to oil. It also contains relatively high concentrations of trace metals, including significant amounts concentrations of vanadium and nickel. That was work done for the European Commission in 2001 by this consulting firm ExternE Externalities of Energy 2001.

Then of course, we get greenhouse pollution, which we've already got a lot of from Coleson Cove, which we're going to get essentially more of the same if this Project goes ahead. We have in New Brunswick the highest Orimulsion® per capita greenhouse gases in Eastern Canada and New England...that was generated for the Premiers and Governors Conference on Climate Change. Coleson Cove is responsible for 20% of all greenhouse gas emissions in New Brunswick...the number of sources there including evidence given at the Public Utilities Board. That's all greenhouse gas emissions in New Brunswick...cars, trucks, businesses, homes, factories, Pulp mills, refineries, everything. So the future of Coleson Cove is a key determinant to New Brunswick achieving meaningful greenhouse gas reduction that is thinking about that environmental driver that was not mentioned the Governors and Premiers targets for greenhouse gas reductions, also not to mention the fact that Canada is likely to ratify Kyoto by the end of the year...which, will make those targets legally binding.

With respect to greenhouse pollution, Coleson Cove towers above the rest. In 1990 with a 68% capacity factor, I think in the EIA they looked at 65% as one of the two capacity factors that they might operate at, 4.7 million tonnes of CO_2 in that year from Coleson Cove. In 1991 at 61% capacity factor, it was 4.2 million tonnes of CO_2. Total for NB Power in 1999 was 8.2 million tonnes. So you see, Coleson Cove is half of NB Power's problem with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. The total for the province in 1990 was 14.7 million tonnes; see therefore Coleson Cove looms large compared to the provincial total. In 1999 it was 17.6 million tonnes and continues to looms large. The likely target for 2012 is around 14.7 million tonnes. Governors and Premiers are looking for stabilization by 2010 and the federal government analysis with applying Kyoto target to Canada has us reducing our emissions in New Brunswick by roughly 3 million tonnes. Staying on the question of greenhouse gas emissions…we read the Environmental Impact Assessment very carefully with respect to how it dealt with carbon dioxide emissions and climate change. NB Power in there claims that in 1990, its emissions were 8.3 million tonnes. This is important because that's the base here against which this particular environmental driver is related…that is stabilization at 1990 levels and reduction below that beyond 2010. In fact, the actual 1990 emissions of CO_2 from NB Power were 6 million tonnes and that's from Environment Canada, which tracks greenhouse gas sources from all across Canada from all jurisdictions and sources. The resolve is that NB Power is under estimating in this EIA the greenhouse gas reduction requirements they would have to meet assuming Governors and Premiers target or the one the federal government is assuming in their Kyoto analysis…underestimating that target requirement by 2.3 million tonnes. So, clearly with Coleson Cove weighing in at half NB Power's greenhouse emissions, 20% of the Province…it's the key to cutting greenhouse pollution. So what happens there is critical as to whether or not we significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Well, the EIA looked at alternatives and we are disappointed to see that the alternatives of the EIA looked at for the environmental regulator was not the same alternatives that NB Power's evidence looked at for economical regulator at the PUB. The two top alternatives that were presented at the PUB as being the most economically attractive were: the existing plant simply switching to a blended fuel that blends in low sulphur oil with NO_x controls and the construction of a new 400 MW natural gas combined cycle unit at the site in combination with reduced operation of the existing Coleson Cove units with the same blend of low sulphur oil and 3% oil and fuel reburn capacity. That is what the economic regulators considered in terms of the two closest most economic competitors to the Orimulsion® option and that's not what the EIA looked at.

The EIA looked at this oil blend option, but looked at converting the boilers at Coleson Cove to burn natural gas directly, which is fantastically costly and paled in comparison…,came out no where near the top in terms of economically attractive in the evidence presented to the economic regulator at the PUB. It was evaluated and rejected.

This is a quote: "the converted plant that is with burning the blended oil option would meet or exceed the required environmental limits for both SO_2 and NO_x expected to be included in the operating license issued by the Department of Environment for operation beyond 2005. That is in NB Power's evidence filed November 1st last year with the PUB and so clearly this option, simply fuel switching with low NO_x burners would meet all expectant regulatory requirements with respect to SO_2 or NO_x. It does not of course address CO_2 whatsoever.

Well, let's look at the emission rates from the alternatives. Now the emission rates from the EIA are expressed differently...there expressed as pounds released per amount of heat generated from burning the various fuel options. Now...the various fuel options open up different efficiencies of generation. In other words, of converting that heat into electricity...so, it's not very helpful really. The better way we would say for comparison purposes is to look at emission rates on a pound of emissions per megawatt hour per unit of electricity that is actually generated. And, that's what was presented before the Public Utilities Board and here is a summary in a table for the Orimulsion® proposal, the oil blend proposal, which the EIA did look at as an alternative, the combined cycle natural gas proposal, which the EIA did not look at and then conversion directly to burn natural gas, which the EIA did look at. I should say that the column or the row there on combined cycle natural gas is actually not combination with Coleson Cove oil burners because the environmental emissions were not assessed by NB Power for the PUB, just stand alone natural gas combined cycle that would be built at Coleson Cove. So, it's not entirely a fair comparison, but you can see sort of the orders of magnitude in difference I guess. And, we were hoping that that would have been one of the alternatives looked at here, so we would have had the proper environmental comparison...but, in any event you can see that roughly on particulates on a per mega watt hour per unit of electricity generated Orimulsion® and simply blending in low sulphur oil option are about the same...that there are essentially none for combined cycle natural gas and none for conversion. For NO_x roughly in the same ball park for emissions per unit of electricity generated either by converting to use of Orimulsion® or simply blending in low sulphur oil and using NO_x burners. If you go to combined cycle natural gas you get a significant cut in NO_x emissions and of course you do too with the direct natural gas conversion although not as much. SO_2 we see the significant reductions from the scrubber on the Orimulsion® option, no scrubber on the oil blend option...so we we're still at 20.5 per mega watt hour, but they're at expectant regulatory limits and then essentially no SO_2 emissions at either the two gas options there. Then we look at carbon dioxide per unit of electricity generated…the oil blended Orimulsion® options are roughly similar. You only get significant reductions if you convert to burning gas in this case. You get some reduction through the direct conversion we know is not economically viable. And you get significant reductions in the case of building the combined cycle natural gas plant there…because they're very high efficiencies basically that that technology operates at. These would rise somewhat in combination with using the oil burners by times. We don't have that number, but it would be significantly less than without the gas plant.

So our concern is the EIA compares false alternatives…that it really should compare the proposed project …false alternatives because it's injected one in there if you diverted directly to natural gas, which is no where economic anywhere on the radar screen. The proposed project should obviously be the one, then compared with fuel switching to low sulphur oil as was done then adding that with building a 400 megawatt combined cycle gas plant operating at a high capacity factor there…the other or so second or third choice of NB Power before the Public Utilities Board. And, we would submit that the EIA in also looking at alternatives look at the impacts on eliminating exports from Coleson Cove. Because, remember the evidence we have is that 62% of the pollution from Coleson Cove is accounted for, will be accounted for by exports.

With respect to comparing air emissions in the EIA, we have a couple of suggestions. Before things go forward or any kind of recommendation goes forward to the Minister…as we think that the emissions per unit of electricity generated should be compared among the various alternatives to give a clearer understanding of the impacts. We think that CO_2 emissions should be compared, which they are not. We think that in comparing the alternatives in the EIA that the particulates need to be broken out by particle size and not just as total particulates. We would also like to see heavy metal emissions compared in the alternatives.

In the reviewing the Environmental Impact Assessment we were quite concerned to see that what they do is look at what they call Valued Environmental Components…and that some significant Valued Environmental Components were left out of the assessment. One of the ones being the proposed Musquash Marine Protected Area, which you can see part of right there…Musquash Head with the single stack from the current Coleson Cove in the background, which will of course be joined by a larger brother if this Project goes ahead…a double stack. That is not considered as a Valued Environmental Component. This is already identified by DFO as an area of interest under the Oceans Act process and is fully expected to be legally protected under the Oceans Act within the next 12 to 18 months.

Another Valued Environmental Component that seemed to be left out was just up further into the watershed…Musquash Watershed…the Loch Alva Protected Natural Area that the Province has designated and will be legally passed into protection as soon the new legislation is enacted this fall I expect.

With respect to the Human Health Risk Assessment, I guess this would be our view on it…there has never been a Human Health Risk Assessment done for a polluter that has

((END OF TAPE 1/SIDE #1)) 7:45 P.M.

…found that adverse human health effects will occur as a result of their project. And, this one didn't either, so it's consistent.

The upshot…fuel switching to low sulphur oil blend and low NO_x burners achieves all known regulatory requirements without the purple haze of the Orimulsion® project without the environmental risks associated with operating the scrubber…that is the massive excavation of limestone, the transporting that on a daily basis to the site and then dealing with the resulting waste from the scrubber. And, of course without risking a marine spill of Orimulsion®. Emissions are comparable in both cases with the exception of a per unit of electricity with the exception of higher SO_2 from fuel switching option and higher sulphur trioxide emissions in the Orimulsion® option. And, certainly the Project must be looked at in terms of greenhouse gas emissions, which was not adequately done in the EIA. Because if this proposed Project goes ahead shackles New Brunswick the high levels of greenhouse gas emission to 2030.

This clearly rules out the life extension and conversion of Coleson Cove to burn Orimulsion® as a viable option if we take the greenhouse gas emission reduction requirement seriously.

We would suggest the way forward here to the environmental regulator is that staff recommend against a life extension at Coleson Cove to burn Orimulsion®. That staff recommend to the Minister to regulate the sulphur content of oil for Coleson Cove to achieve the cap that will be required as the environmental department is doing for other point sources that are burning heavy fuel oil or soon will be. And, that the Department recommend to the Minister that caps be established for carbon dioxide at Coleson Cove as has already been done…legally binding caps in New Hampshire and Massachusetts, two states that are party to the climate reduction, greenhouse gas reduction targets that our Premier has signed onto with the other Premiers and Eastern New England Governors. So, those are our recommendations and that's our response on the air emissions side to the EIA. I thank you very much for your attention and we'll address some of the marine issues and the pipeline issues at Lorneville. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Mr. Coon. At this time I'm going to ask if there are members of the audience who would like to ask specific questions or make specific quick comments with respect to the presentation that the Conservation Council has made. I'm not opening the floor for general comments at this time, just with respect to Mr. Coon's presentation. If you have a comment, you could simply approach a mike and….

DAVID COON

That's my brother (laughter) he's got a new CD going out in September.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

How about people from NB Power? Quick comment, questions or clarifications, whatever the case may be? Yes.

GAETAN THOMAS

I have a few clarifications to make here. First one is with respect to the plume. We will eliminate the existing long trailing brown plume and it will be replaced with a white shorter and it will be looking like a "cloud plume". The reference to Dalhousie with respect to the purple haze will definitely not be an issue at Coleson Cove. The way we're going to approach this is at Coleson Cove the wet precipitator will part of the of the Project, a three-stage precipitator that will reduce the sulphur trioxide emissions that Mr. Coon mentioned and they will be at a level that you will not see that purple haze.

Now, at the same time he referred to some quotes from 1996 from Babcock and Wilcox. This is where some of the issues with the visibility of SO_3 ...we were made aware of these issues and in Dalhousie we added a wet precip after the fact. So, there was some space restriction, there was some engineering constraints and with Coleson Cove we're going all the way. The wet precip will function and there will be no purple haze.

The other point that was mentioned by Mr. Coon is with respect to CO_2. We do have a mitigation plan and it's been file at the Coleson Cove PUB hearings, as well as the Point Lepreau hearings. And, we have a strategy and we can meet the Kyoto targets based on the projects on the go. Coleson Cove was identified per say as a CO_2 reduction project. We will improve the CO_2 emissions by 3% with upgraded turbine efficiency.

Another point I would like to mention is on the fine particulate...Mr. Coon compares before...there are fine particulate issues with the existing heavy fuel oil operation. There is similar levels...vanadium, nickel...all the various heavy metals...and with this Project, everyone of them is reduced significantly. So, the issue after the Project...all the fine particulate including vanadium and nickel will be reduced substantially and they were considered in the Human Health Risk Assessment as part of the detailed calculation. We needed to add all of these different fine particulate for the risk assessment. There are a lot fine particulates for instance that are lower in Orimulsion® ...mercury to name a few.

The other issue I would like to mention briefly and then I will pass it to Greg is on the VEC. I believe the Musquash Harbour was considered.

GREG GILLIS

Thanks Gaetan. We looked at Musquash Estuary a number of times, in a number of places in the reports that are produced. The fact that it may not be included as a Valued Environmental Component in the EIA could be attributed that we tended to lump things together. There are wetlands there for example, Saint Rests Marsh and Red Head Marsh and other areas that are indeed captured under the same element. But, with respect specifically to Musquash Harbour...it was identified as a Geographical Area of Concern in the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment. And, in that it was highlighted as a matter of fact through the workshop proceedings that had gone on through the preparation of that report. As well, there was specific Valued Environmental

Components kind of subsets within that habitat, which were identified in the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment. So, that was given full treatment in that document. As well, the Musquash system is identified as an important system in the Solid Waste Disposal & Storage Area report that was prepared. The concern there was to ensure we weren't going to release materials into that area. And, finally in the pipeline report itself… the information is presented. The Musquash Estuary is identified in the EIA as well as one the sensitive areas of concern.

With respect to Loch Alva, I'm not aware of a driver that would take us to the pathway analysis into that to incorporate that as a Valued Environmental Component. I believe captured the kinds of concerns that would be associated with that in other areas.

(EMERY'S VOICE IN BACKGROUND)

DAVID COON

That's alright this isn't a forum for debate or discussion…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I realize that but if there's some clarification point you wanted to make. I'd give you 30 seconds to do that.

DAVID COON

No. We made our points I think.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

How about the environment department, environment people, do you have any issues you want to rise at this time?

PERRY HAINES

No.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. Thank you very much Mr. Coon. The next presenter is Dr. Paula Tippett. Dr. Tippett...

DR. PAULA TIPPETT

My sister wants me to apologize for the hoarseness of my voice and the stuffiness of my nose, those are health effects of air pollution in Saint John. (clapping)

My name is Dr. Paula Tippett, as a family doctor practicing in Saint John, I'm concerned about the effect of air pollution on my patients' health. When I worked as the District Medical Health Officer for this region, I advised against the plan to convert from oil to coal, so when I learned of this new plan to convert the Coleson Cove power plant to Orimulsion® and asked for a product, I wrote the Minister of Health, Dr. Dennis Furlong, advising him that it was duty to protect the health of the people of Saint John by advising against this Project. This was not done.

Then I took my concerns to our local medical society, the Saint John Medical Society...all the other doctors there agreed and unanimously past a resolution calling on the government not to convert the Coleson Cove power plant to Orimulsion®. (clapping) If the Coleson Cove power plant is to be converted, they recommend it be converted to the cleaner fuel natural gas.

Some of us have reviewed the health report prepared by the proponent and the literature and talked the proponent and those who were responsible for preparing reports for the EIA. We all find the EIA inadequate. These are some of my concerns about the health study done for the EIA and some of the other doctors will be speaking about their concerns as well.

Number one – The study did not consider effects of defects in the pollution control systems or even a by-passing of the pollution control systems. This study author stated that he is assumed that the plant would be shutdown if pollution control systems were not working. However, NB Power has run the Coleson Cove power station in the past for years with its pollution control system disconnected. I didn't understand this... they were always telling me we have state of the art pollution controls...they didn't tell me they weren't turned on. In 1976, the precipitators were installed and they were shutdown due to problems with the ash handling system. They were unable to fix this during the 1970's, but by 1988 Unit One new ash reinjection system was installed, then Unit Two. By the end of August 1990, the third unit had a working precipitator according to a 1990 press release.

The study did not specifically consider the effects of fog, a common occurrence in this area. Acid fog from air pollution was determined to be the cause of the white birch die back in the Saint John area.

The determination of the asthma rate in Saint John was flawed. The author used hospital discharge rates to claim the asthma rate was not high. Most asthma here is treated on an outpatient basis or in the emergency department. There's been at least one high profile case of an asthma death in Saint John during an episode of air pollution and many people here know about that. The author of the health effects study says he did not look at asthma deaths rates only asthma hospital discharge rates. There were certain flaws in the author's review of the medical literature. Some of the mistaken conclusions could be a result of the author or toxicologist not being a medically trained person.

All the health effects of all the products of combustion were not considered. And, the effects on health of a combination of pollutants of a "chemical soup" were not considered.

The cumulative effects of continued heavy metal deposition from burning Orimulsion® on a population already poisoned by deposition from the many years of operation of Coleson Cove power station and from other sources were not adequately considered. The study author did not seem to be aware that Coleson Cove operated for years without even using the rudimentary pollution controls that were installed on it when it was new.

It makes no sense to convert the Coleson Cove power station to a dirtier fuel than at present than expect NB Power to use complex expensive pollution controls to make the air better. It makes some sense to convert to a cleaner fuel like natural gas to make the air quality better. The bottom line is you don't have to make smoke to make electricity. There are cleaner alternatives that will not effect the health of the people of Saint John.

I have some more detailed comments, but maybe you want to hear from the other people in my group first?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

The other people in your group?

DR. PAULA TIPPETT

Well, the other doctors who want to speak as well…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. O.K. So these people that are listed here are part of your group, is that what you're saying?

DR. PAULA TIPPETT

Yes…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. We could proceed that way, that wouldn't be a problem. (clapping) So you're Dr. Keith Wilson are you?

DR. JIM IZZARD

No, I'm Dr. Jim Izzard. I'm guess I'll be out of turn a little bit if that's O.K.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. That's fine…sure…

DR. JIM IZZARD

Yes, my name is Dr. Jim Izzard. I'm basically a family doctor from Saint John. I've been here about 20 years and was born and raised in Saint John. So, I'm part of the group…there's four physicians who became interested in the conversion of Coleson Cove to Orimulsion®. Initially, I saw it in the paper and I really didn't give it much thought. I assumed naively that people in power in NB Power, they're very highly paid people with a lot of resources and that they're there because they know what they're doing. Then somebody mentioned that NB Power is $2.5 billion in debt, so then I thought maybe they don't and if they don't know financially then maybe they don't know what they're doing environmentally and medically, because they are talking about making pollution.

So we had a few meetings and I myself tried to not form any opinion. We did meet with some of the consultants at Courtney Bay Inn. This is very interesting to me because as a physician, if we a consultant he is somebody who is basically going to give a unbiased opinion. And, as Mr. Coon said in Health Risk Assessment studies, there has never been any ill effects found from any of the consultant reports. After this meeting I see why that is so. These consultants are not what I would consider consultants. They are hired guns. (clapping) Isabel, who is the main person who composed the study about the effects of a Orimulsion® spill versus #6 fuel spill…she is an extremely pro-proponent of Orimulsion®. She openly presently stated that she is fighting to get an Orimulsion® plant in Florida. Initially, it's been rejected, but she's going to keep fighting for it. And, actually it 's interesting that in the first page of her Executive Summary, she says about Coleson Cove…she says the plant is being refurbished to burn Orimulsion®. There's no assuming that it may not be the best thing.

As Dr. Tippett mentioned about the Toxicologist, and again he didn't understand some of the local things, the interpretation…he mentioned COPD in infants, which basically doesn't exist. This thing about the addition of toxins to a population that's already been polluted for many years…Saint John is an industrial city. And, we have one of the highest risks…excuse me not the highest risk, but we have an increased risk of bowel cancer because of the exposure to lead over the years.

So that's basically what I have…one thing I found interesting Mr. Thomas, you said in your proposal made for some gypsum storage. You could tell me how much some gypsum storage is over 20 years? You know what I'm saying…like there's going to be 500,000 tonnes of gypsum produced each year, you say on page 11…excuse me you didn't say it…but on page 11, the Summary of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.. It's says it will generate up to 500,000 tonnes of gypsum a year, about 10% percent of that…

EMERY

Do one of you want to answer that?

DR. JIM IZZARD

How much is some gypsum over 20 years?

GAETAN THOMAS

The gypsum is…O.K. in the EIA is based on 500,000 tonnes per year and that is you know the plant operating at 100% capacity factor, so these are always to be on the conservative side…very, very high number to start with. And, when you size equipment, you want to oversize them. Just like the wet precip… to make sure it will do the job. So, the numbers we're talking are on a worse-case scenario would be much less than 500,000 per year…around 65% per cent of that. Then our experience at Dalhousie and Belledune has been that we're able to dispose of most of the gypsum and the gypsum is a very benign product. It's a water issue, a moisture issue within the gypsum that it doesn't meet the quality to ship easily. So, we don't foresee anywhere near the numbers…so if you look at real numbers it will be fairly small. Even the number of cells that have been identified would be much smaller. We expect it to be much smaller than we have indicated.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Has your question been answered sir?

DR. JIM IZZARD

Well, it's just…yes. My main thrust really is having met with some of these consultants and I'm not sure I know enough to argue every little point in there. But, there are some major flaws, particularly in the Health Assessment and that these are not what we would think of as consultants. They have not given unbiased opinions and it's the health of people in Saint John that's at risk. So that's a…..(clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Anyone from the Department wish to comment or ask questions at this point of the presenters?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THERIAULT

Nope…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

People from NB Power have other issues? How about from the general public are there questions or comments with respect now to Dr. Izzard's presentation.

DAVID THOMPSON

I have a question, but it's more in respect to the process here tonight then what Dr. Izzard said. I'm very glad to hear what Dr. Izzard said, but...we're seeing a process here tonight where we have people here from the Environment Department not answering very many questions. And, I don't expect them to...but, there should be people here from the environment department and in the future as this process goes along from the Environment Department who answer the questions. The New Brunswick Electric Power Commission has no responsibility for protecting either the environment or the public health of the people of New Brunswick. They're only responsibility is to run their business economically, which they failed to do in the last five years and as well, to generate electricity and to send it over power lines so the people of New Brunswick have electricity when they need it. And, it's extremely disappointing to see a panel at the front of the room and this was brought to you before this environmental impact process started by the Conservation Council...we said we didn't want to see this type of a panel. We wanted to see the type of the independent panel that we see at the federal EIA process.

The two evenings that the public have to express their concerns that's what those evenings need to be used for. If there's any attempt to address those concerns, they must be addressed by the people who are responsible for protecting the health, welfare and well being of the people of New Brunswick, and the environment of this province. Not people who are out to do some more public relations for their own corporate benefit or to try to get their message out to the media again. As I look around this room, I see all kinds of NB Power employees and their consultants sitting in the back lines of this room so they can look forward and see who's asking questions. And, I see them writing on pieces of paper. I expect this whole exercise is to go and explain away, attempt to explain away legitimate concerns that people of New Brunswick have...not to bring environmental improvement to their Project or improve the environment or do anything different, but to advance their Project going ahead.

This is a very disgusting meeting and I hope that the Chairman goes back with a strong message to Government that this meeting has to be beefed up. There's nothing more disgusting than seeing different sets of figures being given to different groups. At least at the Public Utilities Board we have the ability to cross-examine these nebulous people sitting at the back of the room and to see exactly what they had to say under oath. Tonight we have no ability to do that. There are people sitting here in secret taking notes on what people have to say.

It's only been a week ago since security; the head of security of the Province of New Brunswick came to my house and claimed that I had NB Power documents. And, to see people sitting anonymously around this room and the public has no notion of who they are. I think the first thing we better do is for all the NB Power people to get up in the room and to say exactly what there position is with NB Power. And, to try and get a panel by the next meeting of independent people so that the meeting is not used as a political forum for NB Power to advance their Project. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. Sir. Thank you very much.

DAVID THOMPSON

The request was made to the Manager of the Environmental Assessment Branch, Perry Haines, at least three weeks ago so we wouldn't end up with the farce that we're having tonight. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. sir…Perry Haines…

DAVID THOMPSON

Get NB Power up so we'll know who's here tonight, what they're here for, anyone associated with the Venezuela oil company or anybody else. We want to know who's in this meeting tonight. I ask the Chairman to go around the room and ask people to identify themselves who's with NB Power or the Venezuela oil company or their consultants or who have any financial interest in advancing this Project and seeing it going ahead.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. Sir...Hang on a moment, I'm going to give Mr. Haines an opportunity to respond to your comments then we'll see where we'll go from there.

PERRY HAINES

In response to the comment of wanting a panel similar to the federal panel EA's approach, the federal system could have depending upon the project...we're no the federal panel, this is a provincial EIA process and the process is comments are made and the public has an opportunity to review the report. They've had it for 30 days. They've reviewed all the studies. This is their opportunity and next week will be their opportunity as well to comment on that...to address that. All the issues that are being put forward here tonight and next week are part of the public record...will form part of the decision making process. This is normal that the proponent is upfront in public meetings, full EIA's....

((COMMENT IN BACKGROUND))

DAVID THOMPSON

....it will change fast...if the proponent...

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sorry, if you hang on for a second Sir...I think Mr. Haines is not finished yet

PERRY HAINES

Thank you...thank you...like I say this is the normal approach in which the proponent is upfront, they're not here to do a sale job...they're here to answer any questions that may be put for them. Some people don't have questions, others...

DAVID THOMPSON

I don't think Mr. Coon asked them any questions...I think the presentation spoke for itself and they were directed by the Chairman or given the opportunity to answer the questions...am I correct?

PERRY HAINES

That's correct…there…

DAVID THOMPSON

That's correct!

PERRY HAINES

…to make comments

DAVID THOMPSON

That's right and that's what it boils down to….they have all the ability in the world…they have millions of dollars of our taxpayers and ratepayers money have gone around to every village and every association they could get up before…and given their public relations for the past year on this Project…where those who are concerned about the Project and also concerned about the health and well being of the environment in this province have been given no resources to do anything. Now the public has one night to comment, one night only…and someone mentioned that there was certain limits of time for commenting…well, I'll tell you that when it gets time for me to make my comments for the Conservation Council of New Brunswick, I will not be limited.

Furthermore, in respect to this, it's nothing more than a disgrace. The public have two nights to comment on this, no resources to do research…every time I look around I see the fellow from the Venezuela oil company that's flew in from Florida. I'd like to have one tenth of his airplane bill from New Brunswick to Venezuela for the dozens of trips he's made in the last two or three years to put forth the case of not having Orimulsion® in New Brunswick. And, the one night that the public has an opportunity to get up here and say something then we have to listen to these guys give pat answers and try to explain the thing away, when questions aren't even asked of them.

This has to change. It has to get more of forum that provides some kind of balance. That doesn't give all the cards to a corporation, particularly a public one that's deep in debt and can't even manage its own financial affairs…that ran that plant without pollution equipment for about 10 years. They shut down the precipitators…would not spend the money to repair them as Dr. Tippett said…which refuses to bring oil in double hull tankers to the Port of Saint John. And, refuses to take any responsibility, which cranks up the plant is ever there's a demand for electricity and continues to spew air that's visible to everyone from Grand Manan to Fundy Park. We've had a enough of this and if a panel's going to come and pretend to do public service, well this panel isn't doing it and this process isn't doing it. That's all I have to say and I don't know how many people support me in their room, but I think probably most of the people do who aren't employed by the Power Commission. Of course, probably those who are here employed by them are lackeys of theirs tonight are probably half the people in the room as far as I can see. But, they're sitting here anonymously taking notes upon what people say. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I will ask the NB Power people to identify all NB Power people who are in the room.

DAVID THOMPSON (in the background)

…I just didn't mean employees…I mean anyone who has a business interest in the Project…a positive interest…that are here tonight to explain away the concerns that the people of New Brunswick have and to sell their Project. Thank you.

CHARLES HICKMAN

May I ask Mr. Brogan start….and from Mr. Brogan's point on backwards…

JIM BROGAN

Jim Brogan. I'm the Vice-President of Generation for NB Power

VOICE IN BACKGROUND

Can't hear him…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir would you speak into the mike

JIM BROGAN

Sorry about that…my name is Jim Brogan. I'm the Vice-President for Generation for NB Power, with an overall responsibility for all of the conventional power plants, as well as the Coleson Cove Refurbishment Project.

DAVID THOMPSON

Why are you here this evening?

JIM BROGAN

Why am I here? We've been meeting in public now talking to as many groups as possible for the past year, trying to explain the Project that we have put forward, as well to hear the comments or concerns of individuals over the past year. As you've heard previously all of that information has been gathered and we believe those concerns have been dealt with as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. We looked at this process as being very positive. It gives us the opportunity to answer those questions, in a very formal, but very public manner and I wanted to be here this evening to hear for myself what the public had to say about the Project.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thanks you sir…who'd be the next person to…?

CLAIRE FLOOD

Hi, I'm Claire Flood. I work for NB Power Point Lepreau, and I live in Rothesay. I'm interested in this process more than anything. I probably should have gone boating with my husband and children, but I'm interested in the process so I wanted to come tonight.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you. Others who have an interest in the Project from NB Power or connected to NB Power, would you identify yourselves?

ANDY SMALL

Good evening, my name is Andy Small. I'm the Manager of AMEC Earth Environmental of New Brunswick. Our company was involved in the EIA process and I'm here as an observer.

CHARLES HICKMAN

Jill do you want…we'll keep going down this side and come down the other side.

JILL WHITEHOUSE

My name is Jill Whitehouse and I work for GCP and I'm official note taker this evening.

CHARLES HICKMAN

Perhaps we'll start from….thank you Donny…

ANDY CORMIER

I'm Andy Cormier, I'm Vice-President of Environmental Affairs for NB Power. I'm pleased to be here tonight. We have people here to answer all the questions and I think we'd be remiss if we didn't bring the people in and have them answer any questions that the public may have. I appreciate being here.

DON GOOD

My name is Don Good. I'm with ADI Limited. I'm a Transportation Engineer.

CHARLES HICKMAN

Don could just explain what your role was in the Project?

DON GOOD

Yes, my role was to evaluate the transportation impacts of construction and operations of the refurbished Coleson Cove Project, and also looked at noise impacts associated with vehicle movements.

TIM HOLYOKE

Hi, I'm Tim Holyoke of ADI Limited. And, I did the Socioeconomic Report, which looked at the employment benefits of the Project.

SCOTT FINLEY

I'm with AMEC Earth Environmental. I was responsible for the heritage resource assessment of the Report.

MIKE MURPHY

My name is Mike Murphy. I work with Jacques Whitford Environmental Limited. I earn my living doing air quality modelling studies. That's why I'm here tonight to hear about what the public has to say about all these things.

TANYA NOBLE-SHARPE

Hi. I'm Tanya Noble-Sharpe. I'm with Jacques Whitford Environmental Limited. I contributed to two of the component studies on Surface Water Supply and the Solid Waste Storage & Disposal Area. I'm just here to hear everyone's comments and hear what the concerns were. Thanks.

GREG JOHNSON

I'm Greg Johnson with Jacques Whitford Environmental Limited. I'm the biologist with our company. And, I work...supported with the component study Solid Waste Management Area. And, again I'm here to observe.

DR. BRIAN MAGEE

My name is Dr. Brian Magee. I work with AMEC and had performed the Human Health Risk Assessment. I'm here to answer questions if called on.

CAPTAIN BIFF HOYT

My name is Captain Biff Hoyt. I'm an independent consultant. I did the Marine Transportation Risk Assessment. The purpose of my being here is to answer any questions that you may have about the risk assessment and listen to what your concerns are.

ISABEL JOHNSON

I am Isabel Johnson. I am the Manager of the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment of Spills and I'm here if you have questions about the study.

DR. MARK HARWELL

My name is Dr. Mark Harwell. I'm with Harwell Gentile Associates and I'm a distinguished Professor of Environmental Sciences at Florida A & M University. I was part of the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment and I'm here to answer any technical questions that are raised to us.

KEN KOSKY

My name is Ken Kosky. I'm an Air Pollution Control Engineer providing technical support on emissions and air pollution control technology. I'm here to answer any questions.

LEO BURNS

My name is Leo Burns. I'm a Meteorologist. I'm also a Senior Specialist in Meteorology and Air Quality. This project means a lot to me from an air quality point of view. It results in significant reduction of emissions that we're all interested in and I'm certainly hopeful that the Project will proceed and I'm here to answer any questions that you may have with respect to air quality and meteorology.

ANTHONY BIELECKI

My name is Anthony Bielecki. I'm with NB Power. I'm a chemical engineer and I'm here tonight to answer any questions you may have on waste water treatment or solid waste disposal.

JOHN STURGEON

I'm John Sturgeon. I've working on the engineering aspects of the EIA and putting the EIA together from the engineering input. And, I came as part of the team to help answer any questions you might have in that regard.

NELSON GARCIA

Good evening. I'm Nelson Garcia. I'm in charge of Operations & Environment for Bitor and like the rest of my colleagues here tonight, I'm here to listen to any concerns and provide any information that may be requested. Thank you.

GLEN WILSON

Hello…my name is Glen Wilson. I'm the Director of Environmental Affairs. I've been involved with the environmental process for some time, formally a neighbour of Dave's here in Chance Harbour. .and, I'm just pleased to be here to listen to all your comments.

CHANTAL ST. PIERRE

Good evening. My name is Chantal St. Pierre. I'm an Environmental Specialist with NB Power. I work with the Department of Environmental Affairs. I'm here tonight to listen to what people have to say.

BOB SCOTT

My name is Bob Scott. I'm the NB Power Director of Public Affairs and as of everybody else, I'm here to listen any concerns the public has in respect to this process. Thank you.

CHARLES HICKMAN

That's all of the people in the room that I'm aware of that have been engaged in anyway shape or form by NB Power. From my own point of view, as the Manager of the Environmental Assessment, as was said by some of the people, we're here to answer questions if questions are asked and that's what we see as the purpose here. Yes…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

At this point, I think we will move on to continue the group presentation from Dr. Tippett. I believe there is someone else with the group, and you are madam?

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

....I'm Helen Tremblay of Musquash...

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

And, that is part of Dr. Tippett's...

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

No it's pertaining to what the two doctors have just said...I understand...

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Madame, would you speak into the mike?

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

O.K. Sorry. I understand you're building a new stack for Coleson Cove. Could I ask how tall the present one is?

GAETAN THOMAS

It is 600 foot tall.

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

So, in other words you're replacing it?

GAETAN THOMAS

We're building a new stack, 600 foot tall as well.

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

Have you ever measured the particulate coming from that stack from around the surrounding area? Have you have an air quality on that....how far out the plume from that is reaching?

GAETAN THOMAS

We have Continuous Emissions Monitoring in place right on the stack so we know all the emissions that are coming out of the stack. And, there are some air quality stations in various areas of the City and Charles you can tell...

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

Various areas of the City?

CHARLES HICKMAN

That's correct...

(MARY) HELEN TREMBLAY

The City? But, not the surrounding area? We get the most of it day in and day out. And, the only time we don't get any is if there's someone from the environmental groups are going to be at Black Beach, then coming out of that stack is the most beautiful white mist you ever saw until about 8 O'clock and then the grey, brown, green starts, extra strong, because they haven't been able to run high while there was someone there to observe it. I've lived this ...when was it put there? ...back in the sixties? I have watched this process go on and it's a disgrace. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much madam. I'm going to ask Dr. Tippett to direct the group that is yours and then when that's done we're going to take a break. Are you Dr. Wilson?

DR. KEITH WILSON

I'm Dr. Keith Wilson...I'm a MD PHD that is doing residency in family medicine here in Saint John. I'm a native in Saint John and I became interested in this in working with some of my colleagues that you've heard from before. I have a particular interest in these aspects of things and I want to comment on a few of the observations I made based on the extensive reading. However, I must point out that I have been awake since yesterday morning at 6 O'clock, so bear with me.

I'd like to thank the group for the opportunity to actually speak tonight. It's a very interesting Project, however, I do have a number of reservations based on materials we received from NB Power and also based on very exhaustive internet searching and literature searching, as well in the medical community.

I just want to start the talk with a quote from the Clean Air Act from the Government of New Brunswick that says: "the use of resources in the environment should not compromise the health or economic or social well being of future generations." I want you to keep that in mind, just because this Project has such long term implications, beyond the 20 or 30 year limit of Coleson Cove and I think that is really important to keep in mind. And, to their credit, the people who put together the reports...yes they are hired guns...yes they are meant to in my opinion...probably produce a positive outlook, but I must admit from a research perspective was very well done. However, I do have a number of problems with it. I'm going to divide the talk into two components. One is regarding the Project itself based on observations and literature reviews that I've done...we have done I should say. And, also concerns regarding the EIA and some possible flaws and some further discussion for future...

((END OF TAPE 2/SIDE 2)) 8:30 P.M.

...I suppose research. The product itself...yes, it is probably known as the world's dirtiest fuel and yes, Bitor will tell you, as well as NB Power. Because they've been using it for awhile that it's emissions into the air are relatively clean because of this extensive scrubber process that is linked with the Orimulsion® product. The problem though arises when you look at this dirty material I guess...for those of you that have had the opportunity to read Isabel's...I might add extensive research on the effects of a spill in the marine environment here...I still have some very grave concerns as to what will happen in the Bay of Fundy itself. Because, partly of the considerably volatile nature...although I have to say today its quite nice...the volatile nature of the seas in Saint John. I mean I grew in Lorneville so I guess I'm bias already obviously. But the thing to keep in mind is the Bitumen if it ends up in a water solution only 10% of apparently from your literature will end up surfacing O.K. ...and act as a slick. Of course, that has the impact on birds and other wildlife that are near shores and what not.

But my bigger concern, partly because I did some research on mussels, edible mussels a number of years ago... is the fact that this type of spill should it occur...and yes, Bitor has a perfect record...but again, the Titanic never sank either. But, the thing is this stuff will float below the level of the surface of the water making it fairly difficult, especially in a climate where it's possibly very wavy. It will make it very difficult to clean up.

The study itself although it covered toxicity levels and whatnot within the animals it effects. One problem that I saw and again I may have missed it…because you know we only have so many hours in the day and we're doing this sort of voluntarily out of interest…one problem was the fact that as with the problems we had in the Bay of Fundy over 10 years ago with the paralytic shellfish poisoning…the mussels didn't die. No, we bought the mussels and we ate them then humans became sick. I'm worried that if there was spill in the Bay of Fundy that we'd have very, very deleteriously effects on the sea life and whatnot.

With respect to emissions…I think it's kind of important to understand the perspective of the medical community on air quality. An estimated three million people die each year due to air pollution world wide. This accounts of about 5% of all deaths annually in the world. The World Health Organization estimates that around 30 to 40% of asthma cases and 20 to 30% of all respiratory diseases may be linked to air pollution. Indeed, in 11 Canadian cities approximately 8% of all non traumatic deaths are attributed to combined effects of air borne pollutants resulting in about 5000 preventable deaths annually.

One of the primary areas of concern with respect to fossil fuel use is the emission of matter into the air, obviously. According to Bitor documentation the amount of emissions from an Orimulsion® burning plant is significantly reduced with fully functional post combustion emission control systems. This is especially true when compared to typical oil fired and coal based generating stations. This is not the case however, when compared to natural gas. It is our belief that a very serious…as other presenters have talked about…sort of omissions I suppose from most of the literature was there wasn't a true comparison to the natural gas issue. When we have natural gas flowing right by us and I know all the interesting issues right now that are arising because of the exports to the U.S. and what not…from our sources we got the impression that NB Power did not really make a huge effort in trying to obtain access to the natural gas. Because, I think this Project was so good on paper financially to help the trouble NB Power, as well as meeting the emissions requirements that is sort of came into being. According to some sources, natural gas produces the least amount of toxic emissions compared with other fossil fuels.

With respect to particulate matter that was mentioned earlier…they talked about different sizes of particulate matter. And, again before the pollution control thing … Orimulsion® produces nasty bits of very very fine particles, which deposit into the lower respiratory system. This is bad. To make it very very simple, that's a bad thing. However again, with working emission controls systems this will reduce the amount…however, there is…despite that…the Vermont Agency of Natural Resources have been quoted as saying that "there is evidence to suggest that there may be absolutely no safe level of exposure to fine particles." In a population such as Saint John where the asthma is fairly bad, COPD or emphysema is fairly bad. Having fine particles aggravates an already aggravated airway. It's a very bad thing. Despite Dr. Magee comment's in his report and his quotes of Dr. Bob Beveridge, who some of you might remember from the emergency department here…he was quite the proponent of air pollution issues. There is an effect of pollution in Saint John. That is an issue.

Research conducted by the Environmental Protection Agency in the United States showed a dose response relationship between Orimulsion® flyash concentrations and lung disease in rats. You may say big deal with the rats…However, these major effects showed changes in pulmonary tissue edema , which is swelling. Almost like cancer and local inflammatories that might predispose you to asthma. So keep that in mind. Even though with working equipment there may be less in the air, the bottom line is that the fine particles, we're probably going to have more of and that's a bit of a problem…O.K. so that's something to keep in mind.

Another issue I had a problem with is solid waste. Unfortunately I did not get to read the solid waste report. However, it was kind of scary that when you grew up in Lorneville to find out that there is this sort of almost Sydney Tar Pond toxic waste dumpish…not quite as bad maybe …who knows…lurking near to the Coleson Cove unit. Of course, with the new system that is going to scrub all the garbage out of the air…O.K. …great, we might have better air quality, but there is a bigger picture here. Health is not measured just by air quality…O.K. So, one of the problems I had was with the solid waste component. We're going to be taking the stuff and scrubbing it with natural fresh water from Spruce Lake…now a number of years ago of course, there was a deficit in the Spruce Lake system. I don't know whether you guys had to boil your water or not because I wasn't living here at the time, but I heard about this. But, freshwater is of limited supply in Canada and we're hearing about this more and more. And, unfortunately despite what the report said I would have like to have seen a little bit more proof from the City, not just you guys...you guys ask them for the information and they said it was O.K. But, their data from what I can remember is based on 19...earlier 80's data. O.K. So, to say that the Spruce Lake system can handle, doubling the amount of water usage on a daily basis to over 2 million gallons a day or freshwater...I'm just a bit concerned about that from a health perspective because low water levels in the Spruce Lake system can have deleteriously effects on health.

As part of this part of the talk and there's not much more...I won't bore you very much longer...my sort of recommendation with this is that I think that the natural gas option really does need to be fully explored properly before the Government decides to say yay or nay to Orimulsion®. Maybe with the proper amount of research it will say yes, Orimulsion® is the most viable alternative; however, I just don't think the natural gas option was given its fair chance.

The other thing is it seems that New Brunswickers tend to use more electricity than all of the people in Canada or something near that. We tend to use an awful lot more than a lot of people. Perhaps that's because of electric heat...I don't know. But, the bottom line is that I think we need to start educating New Brunswickers to use less electricity. Because, things as simple as turning your lights off when you're not using them...how hard is that. Again, a lot of people don't do that. I think that in my opinion I think that it's actually NB Power's responsibility, being the sole provider of electricity really to educate the public in energy conservation. Because, down the road, the trickle down effect is that we'll have less requirements for electricity.

And, I talked about the emissions and particulate matter and water usage and what not. The other thing I found interesting is we...when we had met with the gang you see before you tonight, we talked about the traffic issue. I was at one of the Lorneville meetings and discussed the traffic issue of 1700 cars going in and out of Coleson Cove during the whole construction phase, everyday. Now this ...O.K. 1700 cars on the King William Road...that's going to be very interesting for people getting in and out of Lorneville and hopefully when I'm on call I will be able to escape from Lorneville if need be,

(VOICE IN BACKGROUND)

Get a boat!

DR. KEITH WILSON

Get a boat…yah, probably faster to get to the Regional...but, anyway. The thing that I asked them about local pollution…you can imagine that a lot of 40 ton dump trucks plus a lot of automobiles probably with questionable exhaust systems…that are travelling in and out of there and they might be standing still for a long period of time…that may cause problems with local air quality. Now, the gang from NB Power…well, the consultants had a look at this issue actually and they determined that it's below levels of acceptable standards. However, I have a problem with the use of the word "standards"; because, standards don't necessarily equate to no effect. I think it is really important to remember that you might have 1700 cars going in and out. They are all producing pollution and while the stack might be pointing that pollution to PEI or east Saint John as the case may be…I think it's really important to think of the local area as well. Because that is going to cause I think a very bad problem, especially with certain barometric pressure changes that happen typically out our way. Enough of that part…I just want to comment on a few things with the EIA itself.

One big problem I had with this…I'm going to talk mainly on the health one…was the fact that we're using models. It is a typical thing when you're doing environmental assessment for regulatory groups to use models to predict good, bad, worse case scenarios and what not. However, some of the problems I had which we had brought to gang with NB Power was the fact the model itself is being fuelled with some data from the airport here and some data, some upper sounding data from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia. Now, to be honest…I've never been to Yarmouth, Nova Scotia and I don't know how similar the shifting pattern between here and there…but NB Power got an opinion of one person, at least according to your report…from one person saying that's fine to fuel it because they're similar. Again, my point is I'd like to see more research on this. Like I said I'm bias, I'm a research sort not nut…but, I really like research. And, I just find the model aspect, if you're not going to feed it with the right data, despite the low, low levels of that were sorta found. I would have felt more reassured that the conclusions that were drawn…if it were fuelled with the right data.

The other thing that was eluded to earlier, the independence of the whole data analysis…everyone knows that there's the big issue of bias with drug companies sponsoring research and you have to understand that most of this Project was commissioned by NB Power, and they have a vested interest. And, I think it is important to recognize when you're really reading the conclusions and I really hope that Cabinet will look at this. I tend to agree that it would be prudent to have independent review committee that's totally not associated with NB Power and it's Associates to review the information to provide…I don't know if it would be a parallel report to Cabinet or what not…but, to validate the information. Because as Dr. Izzard alluded to…I think it was Dr. Izzard or maybe it was Dr. Tippett eluded to was …I found some inconsistencies with Dr. Magee's reporting of the literature. Now, I didn't have time to go through all of it, but I did happen to find one and then I happen to find another inconsistency, I'm thinking that doesn't make sense, that disease doesn't even exist. That made me question a little bit more of it. So, maybe that's a problem when one person is tasked with building a huge report like that…maybe more people need to be involved…maybe more physicians. But again, I think that a bit more research needs to be put in there.

The second thing is that also that I have a problem with just using models. I who is somebody who is interested in research would have felt a lot better if there was at least some correlation data given. In other words, I want to know where the stuff that comes out of that stack really goes. O.K. Not based on software, despite how convincing a software model is or mathematical model is…if you had one …a couple of points where you could say…it goes out of that stack and lands here. And, it's not within out airshed, I would feel a lot happier in endorsing this Project. And um…well that's enough of that….

Basically in conclusion from my perspective and from discussions with the other physicians that I've been working with, I'm not happy with ….no so much the amount of research, but what was researched in order to say to yes, as someone who is in the medical profession that yes, it will have a benefit to the community. And at this stage, I would not be in a position to recommend the conversion to Orimulsion® until some of these other research questions are asked. In fact there are a few more hopefully by August 14th , if I get time this paper will be written complete with references and lots of pretty graphs. But anyway, the other thing was that just to reiterate, I don't feel there was enough sort of validation of the possibility of natural gas.

And, so just to reiterate one last thing, the Clean Air Act of New Brunswick says: "the use of resources in the environment should not compromise the health or the economic or social well being of future generations.

I'm worried in the 30 years down the road either we're going to continue with this Project, which is kind of scary…or worse still we're left with the sludge from all the precipitators that is now going to be housed in these cells which are sitting on top of a water table….which, I know that there are lot of checks and balances in there, but beyond the 30 years what's going to happen? And, NB Power alluded to the fact that when the time comes they will think of decommissioning it. Well, in other areas that I've worked if you're going to build something that has a limited lifespan, I would have thought that the decommissioning would have happened…or at the plan at least would be in place now so that we'd know what would happen down the road. I think that's a bit of a worry. I'd like to see more of that again before Cabinet makes a decision. Anyway, thank you for your time. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Dr. Wilson. You have one more commenter you said…one more…

DR. MONICA BREWER

I'm going to be very brief. I'm a family physician. I'm also extremely concerned…I have a lot of patients with asthma and with cancer…a lot of health questions can not be answered, we do not know why, why certain diseases have higher incidences in this area. So we might find out later that it is something that we weren't measuring or were not aware. I have concerns. I feel that pollution is a cumulative problem. The people of this area have had a lot of pollution. And, we should now chose the cleanest, the very cleanest …I don't care about the cost…we have to chose the cleanest option for the people of Saint John. We can not choose something that is alright, but…right now it has to be the cleanest option. From the health point of view it has to be the best we can possibly offer.

I have one more point, which is the fact that Dalhousie seems to be the only plant in North America burning Orimulsion®. That makes me nervous, because I wonder do the other people, the other power plants all over North America, do they not want cheaper fuel. One wonders…what are the questions…what is the rest of the world thinking…why are they not using this fuel? Then I think let's get some real data, let's go and get the real people in Dalhousie, let's measure the water, let's make measurements in their blood, let's do things are real, not models and try and see if we can answer and say yah…look it's been there since 94, the people there are actually healthier.

Then maybe that would be more convincing than what we have now.

I think we have a lot of questions about this fuel. I don't feel like its safe at this point. I think we have to answer quite a bit more before we should go and commit ourselves to 20-30 years of a plan like this. We really need to know a lot more. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Dr. Brewer. I believe it was Dr. Brewer wasn't it? At this point I'm actually going to take a few minutes break. There is some coffee and some refreshments I believe on my right over here. If you wish to approach people during the break with specifics, please feel free to do so. No more than 15 minutes, I'll call the meeting back to order.

((MEETING BREAK --- 8:50 P.M. – 9:10 P.M.))

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you ladies and gentlemen, we'll call the meeting to order again. We'll proceed. First NB Power people would like to clarify a couple of points and I'll turn the microphone over to Charles Hickman or is to Glen…Greg?

GREG GILLIS

My name is Greg Gillis. I'm Vice-President of Operations with AMEC Earth Environmental and I'd just like to make a few comments about some of the things that were said earlier in the evening. AMEC is an international company. We do a fair amount of money's worth of work throughout the world. Our revenue stream is about $8 billion annually. We do things like the clean up at the world trade centre, repairs to the Pentagon, build bridges, build major projects throughout the world. And, I can assure you that in that work that we do we use factual information and provide our clients with advice. And, the day that we start twisting our information and twisting our advice is the day we stop being employed by our clients. Our reputation is very precious and in no way would we impute or impugn our reputation by not using the appropriate methodology according to what we see as being appropriate for the task at hand. That in one way I hope addresses some of the concerns that were indicated about the independence of the review.

The second thing that was mentioned was the use of models. In the strictest application in the scientific method, one would replicate an experiment and control one variable in order to determine the effect of that variable. Unfortunately, with Environmental Impact Assessment in major projects…we're not going to build two Coleson Cove plants and control one variable and test it. We don't have wherewithal to do it. It would be ridiculous to assess that so we use models. The way we use models is we apply validated models that have been applied and verified throughout various parts of North America and other parts of the world. The information used with these models is again validated and reviewed with reviewers such as we had with this Technical Review Committee. We have peer reviews within our own companies. That information is solid. We do not use the information if it is not applicable or we do not think it is valid for use. I'm not going to say anymore, but what I will do is invite Dr. Brian Magee who is a toxicologist with our operation our company from Massachusetts, who is responsible, who is senior author for the Health Risk Assessment to come forward and give brief outline of some of his concerns. Thank you very much.

DR. BRIAN MAGEE

Thank you very much. My name is Dr. Brian Magee. I have a PHD in Toxicology from M.I.T., degrees in Chemistry and Public Policy as well. I'd like to thank the commentars for taking the time to plough through those documents, which are quite voluminous as you know. We appreciate your time in doing that, but quite a few things were said in the last few moments that I would like to clarify.

First of all I'd like to give just a small background on what we did in terms of this evaluation. We used standard guidance that is specifically designed for this purpose, i.e. for determining what the risks are associated from a potential construction of a new project that emits chemicals from a power plant stack. I say power plant, but it could be any kind of a combustor, any facility that has a stack that emits chemicals. This guidance has been under review, it's been repeatedly updated, it's constantly being revised, it's been around for about 15 years with the latest version being 1998, so it's quite recent. It's been used hundreds of times whenever a facility needs to be permitted and the people of the government need to make the decision as to whether it is appropriate to permit it. They use this guidance. So, we did not go off and create anything from scratch. We didn't do anything on our own. It's government guidance and my report if you're not all aware is accompanied by an appendix, which is at least six inches thick, which shows I have nothing to hide. I'm using all of the government algorithms, equations, perimeters and inputs and every number can be checked which is why I do that. I don't want it to be a black box. I want it to be a completely transparent and open process.

One very key point that I'd like to make is that several individuals stated that all Human Health Risk Assessments show no problem. Show no adverse effects. Well I personally have done over a 100 Health Risk Assessments that have showed problems. When it's a proposed project I tell the client this isn't going to fly. It doesn't pass. They say well I guess we have to redesign it. So, I'm providing advice in the design of the project to make sure that the project does pass.

And secondly when there are waste sites, like an old hazardous waste facility where something was dumped years ago, usually all of those Health Risk Assessments show problems, which is why they are remediated...which means they're cleaned up. And, in particular one that I did recently was the Sydney Tar Ponds, which as you all know is a problem and it is currently being cleaned up.

Now some individuals have stated that we were furiously taking notes. I was because I wanted to get down the concerns on paper so that I could try to address them. Now I won't be able to address them all but let me just skip through my notes pretty quickly.

One earlier comment from Mr. Coon was that we didn't consider operation of the plant to 2030. That's simply not true. The Health Risk Assessment assumes 30 years of operation. Now we didn't consider 30 years previous and 30 years new, but it's easy enough to multiply my answers by two and you'll see that it doesn't change the conclusion very much.

Here's the issue about risk assessments always being good...I just commented on that. Dr. Tippett has suggested that my recording of asthma rates were flawed. That could very well be. I simply went to government reports produced by the Provincial Government and put those numbers with citations in the report. So, if there's a problem with that, I stand corrected, but they're not my statistics. There government's statistics.

There's an issue about we didn't evaluate asthma deaths....well, there was no appropriate mechanism in the Guidelines for doing so, but we did do some calculations after the fact that I've shared with some of the people here in the room at the last meeting. And, when we used the risk factors in the ICAP model, which is one that the Ontario doctors have produced, as well as the Environment and Health Canada model…I calculated less than one asthma death per year from emissions from the facility. I can share those specific numbers with you later if you like.

Someone suggested that we did not consider all pollutants and all health effects. That's simply not true. It's a very long laundry list of health effects and pollutants. They're all there. You can have a look at them.

We didn't consider cumulative effects. Not true…we added them all up.

We didn't consider deposition of metals over time. We did consider deposition of metals over 30 years. Again, if you prefer to know what the answer would be over 60 years, multiply by two.

There was an issue brought up several times that we falsely or incorrectly reported a disease in children that only occurs in adults. Well, I know full well that chronic obstructive pulmonary disease does not occur in children and I have no idea where this issue is coming from. If you point out to me in the document, may be we'll find a typo. But, I certainly know that doesn't occur in children.

It was stated that we did consider…that we're adding toxins to a stressed community. Not true…the toxicity numbers assumed that the people being exposed are sensitive individuals, i.e. they're stressed.

Dr. Izzard, who I'm not sure if he is in the room here now, suggested that new toxicants were being from the facility under Orimulsion®. Not true, it's all the same chemicals, all the same metals.

The issue of particle size was brought up. It is true that particle size from the burning of Orimulsion® is shifted to smaller particles. As it turns out, we go to very small particles; the particles are not retained in the lung. There's an inverse proportion regarding particle size and retention in the lung.

A study from EPA on pulmonary toxicity of Orimulsion® was presented. It is true that Orimulsion® caused in that test some pulmonary toxicity, at no greater level than oil did. Oil and Orimulsion® were equivalent and in some cases Orimulsion® was better. But, what important to note that the dose given to the poor rats was 2000 times higher than you would get in a year and they gave that to the rat in a single day.

Vehicle risk was evaluated and I'll rap it up…we showed that the vehicle risk associated with all the additional traffic was again very, very low. It was like a 10 to the minus 8 cancer risk for those of you who know those kinds of numbers. I think I'll leave it at that…just wanted to correct and make some clarifications to some of the issues.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Mr. Coon, I see you here. Are you at the microphone to specifically address something that Dr. Magee has said?

DAVID COON

I am. There seems to be some misunderstanding Mr. Chairman about this Environmental Impact Assessment process with regards to the public participation. If I was someone off the street with some concern about this Project, that would have shut me down. I would not, I would have been entirely intimated about speaking in the second part of the meeting to relay my concerns to our environmental regulator. It's bad enough that we start off with our environmental regulator, who's supposed to be there working hard, safe guarding the public interest with respect to the environment being in the minority on this panel, the proponent is in the majority…makes no sense whatsoever. I'm asking that you stop this process, which allows response and rebuttal to the input and concerns raised to the public. We're here to raise our concerns and give our views to our environmental regulator. If there's questions of clarification, those can be put…but, the way this is suppose to work is our environmental regulator takes the input and concerns that they've taken and feel that are significant and important and they go to NB Power and their consultants and you address these things. Because these things were raised by the public, we want to have you answer them to us. Not in this forum entering into some kind of debate, otherwise I'm not going to get into a debate because we're going to go all night in this debate…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I understand…

DAVID COON

….this is for the public to come and give their views….

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

….I understand and your point is well taken

DAVID COON

…to these two individuals on the right hand side. And, I would ask and then I'll close then, ask that you Mr. Chairman you consider with all respect to write a letter to the Minister of Environment and Local Government and give your observations on the process and whether the process is working or not and reflect some of the comments that are being made from the floor here about the process, with respect to the public component of our Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Yes, I'll take your comments under advisement for sure. Thank you very much. (clapping) Mrs. Pataki-Theriault did have some comments to make.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THERIAULT

I just actually had one comment…when one of the doctors was speaking of an independent review body…that is actually what we're suppose to be doing here. We have review committee of 20 some odd people who have expertise in many things and those are the people who have been reviewing this document. So, it's not just NB Power, as a matter of fact, some of the methodology that was proposed by NB Power has been changed in accordance to the Technical Review Committee and the resulting document ended up an accumulation of many months of back and forth and analysis.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I certainly hope that no one is intimated from speaking. I understand Mr. Coon's comments perfectly well and appreciate you making them, but I certainly hope no one will be reluctant to make whatever points they wish to make. There are two more presenters who have asked to be on the list. The next one is Gordon Dalzell of the Saint John Citizens for Clean Air Committee or for Clean Air. Sir, if you're ready the floor is yours.

GORDON DALZELL

Good evening and thank you very much for the opportunity to address the Environmental Impact Assessment public meeting. Since 1995 the Saint John Citizens Coalition for Clean Air, a volunteer public interest group, have been advocating for substantial emission level reductions from Coleson Cove, specifically calling for scrubbers and control technology to reduce those high levels of emissions that are presently been well known.

Now the last public review process for the certificate of air quality approval, we strongly urged the government to put in a condition in the air quality approval to ensure that NB Power had to substantially reduce their emissions from this plant during the life of that Certificate of Approval. We were pleased quite frankly to see a condition in there that was included that ordered NB Power to come up with a plan to reduce their emissions at Coleson Cove 30% by 2005 and 50% by 2010 during that approval process. NB Power did register that plan and that being the conversion of Coleson Cove to Orimulsion® fuel with the scrubbers and other control technologies that will result in SO_2 being reduced as cited there by 77%, NO_x, 70% and particulate, 75%..

These are the pollutants that are some of the ones that contribute to smog and ozone formation, acid rain that cause so much impact to the environment and health. In that sense, from that perspective, we are on the record for wanting to see the appropriate steps in being taken to reduce those emissions. Now, we recognize the expectant emissions…to expect the reduction of those emissions are from the scrubbers and the control technologies, not the Orimulsion® fuel. Now of course the Public Utilities Board cited that the economic conferred that this was the cheapest option and of course, NB Power went with this option and they cite that it's the only way to give us that type of control technology to do it. But, we had publicly asked is that the only option?

We have publicly questioned whether or not there are other options? And, we respectfully submit that there are other options: low sulphur fuel, the installation of best available of controlled technology on the existing plant or better still of course, convert to natural gas turbine unit. So our position is that it's too bad that in order to achieve these emission reductions, we have settled with the Orimulsion® option, considering what we believe to be the negative impact of these Valued Environmental Components.

Now up until today…we're now going to get into them all now…we're up to 50 pages of documentation on just those …impact of those valued components and we'll be submitting those to the Department. We'll highlight some of them, because I think they need to be addressed a bit tonight in terms in order to get this Orimulsion® project going. What is going to be the impact on the other parts of the environment, whether it's the waste water treatment, whether it's the pipeline, etc? We'll get into a few details here in a minute.

We're also further on record as a group that this Project will add to greenhouse gases to our atmosphere for another 25 years. And, during the Public Utilities Hearings we raised that issue and promoted that as one of the reasons why this Project may not have as much merit at all from the greenhouse gas perspective. So, to say there's no some ambivalence…you know in one sense we've advocated for the emission reductions and hear is a plan that comes up with them. But yet when we start to look at this in more depth, we start to recognize that there is going to be a real and potential cost in order to get there. It's a double edged sword and it does cause for some, some ambivalence and some difficulty.

It's kind of interesting you know, over the years NB Power for years and I think Mr. Burns of course is here…that Coleson Cove really didn't have much of an impact on the local air quality of Saint John. In fact they did do a study on that question one time. It's interesting when the emissions were high and we were saying "it was" and they were saying "no, there's only a minimum impact on the ambient air quality". But, now that the Project now identifies there will be emission reductions and there are value to these, then it does have an impact on Saint John. I guess the EIA confirms and validates what we always kind of believed that there is really (clapping) environmental impact from the air quality perspective. It kind of confirms what we always said. It's interesting how it was argued from both perspectives.

O.K. in a sense we're pleased to see these emissions rates that are cited SO_2, volatile organic compounds…I'm sorry PM and NO_x being reduced, because we know particularly NO_x the contribution it plays to ozone formation…this is one of the high risk hot spots for ozone in this region of the Maritimes, the lower mainland of British Columbia and the Windsor Corridor…the

Quebec area the other two. So, anything that is going to reduce NO_x, which as we know with volatile organic compounds and the sun cause ozone. So, anything that's going to reduce that load from the ozone formation perspective has to be noted.

Now, we're going to get into some of these specifics here. I'm going to try to run through them quickly. For example, they did talk about upset conditions, but we found that the upset conditions that the plant would be tripped and they would have to have these hot or cold starts. For example, that's what I understand they included as upset conditions. But, I want to remind everybody that here in Saint John…we're not going to get into this in too much detail…but, years ago we asked for upset conditions to be included in another EIA and that was for a local oil refinery. At that time they didn't include upset condition in that EIA, although we had called for them and guess what happened there were upset conditions as we all know from that facility that caused quite a lot of impact for that company and also for the public. So, it shows you that with this advanced technology and the best technology, which that facility had there were some very serious upset conditions there that did have an environmental impact. So, we can not stress enough and we don't think that these upset conditions are good enough. They have to look at more upset conditions. What happens if technology fails? Whoever thought that local industry, I cited you know would have such a serious challenge in some of its operational development in the commissioning period as we know? So we'd like to see that expanded.

We're going to run through more on the air side here…oh yah, the other thing we're concerned about here and I think it was raised tonight. How do we know that this technology, these scrubbers and all the new technology that is listed there that there won't be some break down or some deterioration? How reliable is it? I don't see any kind of analysis about the reliability. I understand it may be reliable. But, we'd like to see much more analysis to show you what is the percentage of the reliability of the control technology. We don't want to see this equipment being sent out for repair or shut down and consequently have all these emissions during an upset condition or problem there.

Now let's get into some more specifics on the air…there's one statement in there that really caught my attention in terms of the monitoring. It says quote: " in light of the extensive ambient monitoring network that currently exists in Saint John Area, NB Power proposes not to add additional monitoring systems to the existing network." We would like to ask NB Power and the regulator to reconsider that. We think there is room for increased monitoring capacity in the community for particulate for example. As you know, there is some monitoring stations here, one is up in Forest Hills that the Federal Government runs. You have to remember that's not in the air quality index network. There's more room there to give us and give the Department of Environment and Local Government…give them more capacity as part of this Project or perhaps you could just do it anyway…see if you can upgrade or help upgrade the monitoring network that we all need…that the community needs to measure these pollutants. So, we didn't like that statement and we don't think it's valid. We think it should be reviewed.

In terms of …let's get into some of the specifics…mercury for example. The EIA appears not to have cover or study this very dangerous pollutant. We believe the air quality assessment analysis on mercury is inadequate. It needs to have its own separate heading with special analysis. We request the EIA air quality focus more attention on this and focus on it. It is mentioned, I could only find it a couple of times. Of course, I might have missed a section. I do accept that. Because we know with mercury there's no acceptable level for it. Of course, Canada has very strict regulations and more effort to control mercury emissions.

Now traffic emissions…the report does acknowledge the increase in emissions from the existing phase through the construction and through the future operation. Even though it states that these emissions are not substantial that does not mean they won't be harmful impacts from the diesel fumes. Now I just got a report recently on the diesel fumes on school buses and just it's just frightening. I'm going to send it to the Minister of Education. In terms of the idling of school buses…they all use diesel fuel. When they talk about these trips and all the number of trucks, which is really quite substantial.….it doesn't talk about the idling time. The idling time as you know one of the more serious aspects of motor vehicle emissions, so we'd like to see a great deal more work done on that. I'd be glad to share this very highly qualified technical report that was given to me by a….

((END OF TAPE 1/SIDE 3)) 9:34 P.M.

…highly respected scientist and well known person in the community.

O.K. Now the acid aerosols, I didn't find that they really addressed that as well. You know in the ARMA Committee…I was a member of the ARMA Committee as some others here were…that whole issue came up and I'd like to see more analysis in the impact assessment address these gases. We understand Saint John is more susceptible to them because of climate and fog and other conditions. We would like to have more analysis of that please and have those addressed.

O.K. The noise study…no mention of construction…they talk about construction noise…now if you want to know what construction noise is you have to live where I live, next door to well a large industry that put in 10,000 piles…pile driving. It took two summers and they went about every minute and a half. They went from 7 a.m. until 7 O'clock at night for two summers. You have to live next door to that to appreciate what it does. Now I don't see any references to pile driving, perhaps it's not going to be a problem. I understand the local community of Lorneville is only a kilometre away, but I would think that should have been more specifically done. that to appreciate what it does. Now I don't see any references to pile driving, perhaps it's not going to be a problem. I understand the local community of Lorneville is only a kilometre away, but I would think that should have been more specifically done/…now if you want to know what construction noise is you have to live where I live next door to well a large industry that put in 10,000 piles…pile driving. It took two summers and they went about every minute and a half. They went from 7 a.m. until 7 O'clock at night for two summers. You have to live next door to that to appreciate what it does. Now I don't see any references to pile driving, perhaps it's not going to be a problem. I understand the local community of Lorneville is only a kilometre away, but I would think that should have been more specifically done/…now if you want to know what construction noise is you have to live where I live next door to well a large industry that put in 10,000 piles…pile driving. It took two summers and they went about every minute and a half. They went from 7 a.m. until 7 O'clock at night for two summers. You have to live next door to that to appreciate what it does. Now I don't see any references to pile driving, perhaps it's not going to be a problem. I understand the local community of Lorneville is only a kilometre away, but I would think that should have been more specifically done.

Now these trucks….there's another aspect to it…there's so many things here I don't want to tie up too much time…but, I know what it's like to hear these trucks applying their air brakes and gear shifting, etc. In terms of construction noise we know what it's like having lived through a big construction project next to our neighbourhood.

There are a few other important references if we could still continue…just quickly. O.K.

Now here's something here…I couldn't believe this…it had to do with the pipeline. I think if there's anything that's really vulnerable, really questionable about this Project…I couldn't believe some of the impact of this pipeline is going to have. You have to really believe this and you have to see it and study it to understand what it's going to mean. Now there's one statement in there that really questions the validity of the Study and that is quoted: "the final pipeline location and construction methods may differ from the description provided in this report." Now here they give a big study with maps and all the Valued Environmental Components and all the impacts to the species and all the rest of it and then they say…there's a big escape hatch…the whole thing could be switched and changed subject to the "owner" of the pipeline. And, the owner is not NB Power; the owner is another large industrial corporation in the community. So anyway, that should not be. We should know what the final location is…the people in the Debly Subdivision and Harbour View and all the people out in East Saint John have a right to know exactly where that pipeline is going to go and not to have it changed subject to some other approvals in some kind of quiet setting in a closed door somewhere.

The pipeline project should not be approved until the location and construction are finalized and a full EIA supplementary assessment is done.

O.K. Now there's another part about this pipeline…it says "the expert review noted that the Irving Oil Limited has and continues to have an action plan to maintain a safe reliable pipeline." Well, what is the action plan? You know these kinds of things you can't leave them out. Let's see the action plan and put it in writing so we can look at it.

Now, we're concerned about the minimal air and noise emissions that are anticipated during this operational phase. Now, the pumping and booster stations…anybody who's been along the Maritime Northeast Pipeline or some of these pipelines…you can hear…sometimes you can feel the vibrations sometimes of these compressors and these piping stations. Now some of these people, the ones present here tonight, can feel the vibration of one out in his neighbourhood. But, there's a lot of issues around that need to be addressed. So, we need more analysis on that.

Now when it comes to…oh, there's so many others here we won't…the security of the site. Now, the ATV's …now we all know there are 30,000 of these ATV's. They're growing at a phenomenal rate. It says just because we're on the Right of Way that there not going to be an impact. I believe these ATV's and even though people I suppose use them accordingly, but they can get onto access of these Right of Ways and I worry about the impact they would have on a Right of Way like this into the sedimentation, into the deconstruction and peacefulness of nature that the habitat need to exist. So, there's a big study....the New Brunswick Government did a study, an ATV study, it is referenced, but I would like to see the environmental team...the Technical Review Committee take a special look at that. And also, come up with some mitigations suggestions as to how it's going to be managed and controlled.

O.K. again we've...I was just so surprised really...I didn't believe...I didn't realize I guess...I used to live out in Anthony's Cove in that area...I didn't realize how many Valued Environmental Components there really were: wetland resources, plant species at risk, wildlife, birds, salmon...you know it's going to go through three watercourses. It's shocking really, I mean how are you ever going to pull this thing off without disturbing and upsetting that whole equilibrium out there especially when you have another pipeline built with the LNG coming. Remember you've got a whole bunch of these things being developed: the LNG pipeline, the existing pipeline... now this one. It just goes on and on. And, we're very concerned about that.

So, basically...O.K. In terms of blasting...here's another issue. There's references there to geology studies, but in that whole reference to geology, it doesn't even mention what would be the effect of blasting or even earthquakes. They say there's a minimal risk of an earthquake, but you know there is a major fault line that goes from Alma down through St. Stephen there...I forget the name of it, but it does go along the Bay of Fundy, I understand...it goes right down Union Street...an actual fault line. I remember David Thompson telling me about that at one of our meetings. These are the kind of things you need to study and I was disappointed not to see that.

The other thing about the traffic...one of the weakest parts of this whole study was the Transportation Report too. When you look at the number of trucks and the impact it's going to have in and around Lorneville, I was really surprised. Because, we know for example...it talks about normal driver behaviour that everything is going to be basically O.K. even if its there's to be 2000 trucks a month or whatever it is....a phenomenal amount...I'm sorry I don't have the right number. It talks about normal driver behaviour. Now I know what its like to live next to a large facility where there are 1000's of people, in that case working there, who all want to get out at 4:30, because I had to help my wife get to work and being blocked in our own street and people playing chicken going down Grandview Avenue to get home in the winter. It's not a very pretty sight. And, that's the kind of thing you're going to face. You're not going to get normal driver behaviour. You're going to get people who are impatient, you want to get home and the residents I'm sure are going to be impacted. So, it goes on and on and I won't say too much. We're going to have all our pages of notes given to you and we certainly want to have them on the record.

The points that the Conservation Council alerted to the community, Mr. Coon had mentioned…we would definitely want to see in writing a complete and thorough analysis of all those points that the Conservation Council raised and put them into a report that will give the information that the public require to understand those points that Mr. Coon has made.

O.K. I think what we'll kind do is conclude there…I can actually go on. I want to tell you one thing; many of us have spent a fair amount of time going through this. I personally have read absolutely every binder, every supplementary study and every line in the whole works. It took…actually it's a massive job…but, I said I'm going to read all this stuff and we're still going through it. But, we're going to do our homework and raise we hope important issues. It does raise, I have to admit even though at the end of the day these emissions levels are ones that we want and we've been striving for…it does worry me about the real and the potential impact to get there with this particular fuel and with this particular Project.

One of the last things I want to mention is…I've been following the Orimulsion® Bitor of America and the conditions in Venezuela very carefully. I read the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times just to find out about these things. I've been following that very carefully and the last reports I got and I can give them to you and I'm sure perhaps somebody else…the conditions…the stability of supply of that fuel…if I was running this show or making some decisions around this…I would be very worried about the security of supply, even though we have been assured by the representative from the oil company. But, from what I'm reading the economics of the country and the political stability of Venezuela and even the production levels for that national oil company have been reduced lately…although they were back up in June…but, they were reduced. So, there's a lot of things I've been reading and I would urge the Technical Review Committee to consult with the Department of External Affairs with the Government of Canada and ask the Government of Canada to do an independent consultation on the political state of the oil supplier or the Orimulsion® supplier. I'm sure the Department of External Affairs would through their expertise provide the Government of New Brunswick with a thorough, who knows…maybe a confidential study…who knows, but they will tell you what's going on in that country and what impact if any those conditions would have on the security of supply. One company, one company in the world will produce this Orimulsion®.

O.K. Those are just a few of the points I'd like to leave tonight and thanks very much for the opportunity.

One point I'd like to make in terms of process I think tonight is a good example of how inadequate this type of situation is to address all of the community concerns. It's time for the Department of Environment and Local Government to review the EIA Regulation to allow a more thorough kind of a hearing something like the PUB process or some of the CEPA process. Two meetings like this…totally inadequate, it doesn't do justice to a very complex project and we have more of them coming down the road, which could include a petro chemical plant, an LNG facility and we also have more probably to come.

So basically that's it for our comments and we thank you for listening to them and please to be able to be here. I have to say that when we did our guideline review, remember the public were allowed to raise all the issues…quite frankly I was satisfied that all the issues that we raised were included in the study. Well, we weren't always happy with how they were all handled, but we do acknowledge that they were studied, they were reviewed and they are in the reports. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thanks you very much Mr. Dalzell. We have one more presenter that's listed than following that presenter we'll open the microphones for general comments or questions from anyone. So, the next presenter is Vern Garrett…sir…

VERN M. GARNETT

Sorry I'm not a presenter, I had some questions…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Garnett…sorry…

VERN M. GARNETT

That's O.K. you can call me Santa Claus. I live out in Red Head now. I'm on my 29th year out there and I'm 46 and I notice things. I'm an organic gardener. I have been since I've been a child. If you come out and visit my place, you'll see what I mean. Gordon, everybody that have been out there and they can tell you want it looks like and Susan gets some seeds from me. The thing is I'm the gentleman, the person that Gordon mentioned that feels the vibrations from this pipeline that is there now. I worked for that company when the pipeline was being built. I walked the pipeline. I know what the ground is like. I know what the land is like. And, it's a very poor situation. When I first moved out there from where the house went over at the corner of Ocean Drive and Red Head Head it was a 15-20 minute walk to get to the bank. Now you can go to the edge of the road and jump into the water now. I asked the question before if the pipeline vibrations…the harmonic vibrations, if that had something to do with the bank going away. Nobody could answer that question. Nobody could answer at the CBC's "Good Question", they couldn't get an answer for it, so maybe somebody could get an answer for me now.

In the subdivision where I live there are two pump houses and there's the well watershed protection areas that are overlapping each other. The proposed pipeline and the pipeline right now that is there, goes through this protection area. Our water is one of the best waters in the province. It even surpasses Sussex, because we've even got people coming down from Sussex getting water from us. It's excellent. I'm worried what's gonna happen when they put this new pipeline in when they're doing the blasting? When they're doing the pile driving and there's areas out there where they piledrived…drilled down 200 feet and struck nothing but sand and clay and mud. What's gonna happen? And, they do the vertical drilling under the streams…how far are they going to have to vertically drill down? Are they going to have to go down 1000 feet before the stream collapses?

All those streams…they say there's three streams...there's actually more than that. It's flawed in the point that if its not showing up on a map on 1 in 10,000, its not covered as a waterway. But, I can show you streams…I'm a size 8…I can show you streams that are that wide that produce salmon par on the Miramichi and the Hammond River and places. And, that doesn't show up in 1 in 10,000…that's flawed there too.

Like I say I'm a bit concerned of where the pipeline is going to go through. It's going to go through some historical areas, where there's artefacts possibly located. When my family first come to this country they landed between Mispec and Cape Spencer. They come ashore there on the cove and they built down there, then they moved out Loch Lommond Road later for a better farming area.

I'm concerned what its going to do out there just from the transportation of vehicles on the pipeline. That's where my big concern is...and also with only the 3% reduction in greenhouse gases. I mean everything is being reduced and I would admit...thank you very much...do it better. Natural gas would be nice, but there are also other alternative fuels that you can burn there. You can mix the fuels...the plant alcohol and this sort of things you need to get you a better oxygenator and reduce these gases. I would just like to get comments about that... about the production of our water wells out there and not only the community wells. That's a city water well system, but there's also lots of private wells out there. There are springs out there. The lake that's off of Black River Road is actually spring fed and, Mispec River is spring fed. So, that's something you have to look at.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you sir. Would someone like to answer Mr. Garnett's question about ...first of all...your first question was about vibration of the pipe.

VERN M GARNETT

Because the material going to be going through the Orimulsion® is a lot denser and heavier, so if you do get a vacuum lock they're going to have to put an increased pressure on the pumps and I think that's what's causing most of the vibrations now. There's a little air lock or something and they have to kick up the charge or decrease it and they get overflow.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Has that been a consideration?

GREG GILLIS

As I understand it Orimulsion® is an easier fuel to pipe through the pipes, so I would suspect that there'd be a reduction in the vibration potential. I quite frankly haven't heard that as an indication of the problem of erosion in the Red Head area. We did an investigation of the Red Head area just a few months ago looking at the erosion there. A lot of that was associated with the sea activity. I've not investigated that whatsoever so...

VERN M. GARNETT

I know what the problem is out there...it's clay and sand. The sand washes out and the clay slips down and the way it goes.

GREG GILLIS

Yep, I understand that and that is one of the concerns we have with some of the pipeline routing in the western part of Saint John, because the clay lends...which would set up a situation they had actually slope failure in West Saint John, so we're very much aware of that situation. I'm not aware of that kind of analogue situation occurring along the proposed pipeline corridor that we looked at or the alternatives to it. What we did do when we selected...or identified the alternatives was to move it away from the coast line to make sure we stayed away from areas of erosion or creation.

With respect to your concerns about blasting, blasting consideration is one that is there. A lot of the activities for pipelining in this region have been able to be done without blasting...just use of the whole ramp, so if blasting is going to be required, wells will be protected. The well field will be protected.

With respect to heritage resources...I think that was one of your questions...

VERN M. GARNETT

Yes, archaeological sites...

GREG GILLIS

...archaeological sites...we have established and identified a protocol that the owner of the pipeline has agreed to, which would be put in place for any construction activity during the installation of the pipeline. That protocol will call for an archaeologist to be on site at high potential areas if anything is found, work will cease and the find will be investigated fully.

VERN M. GARNETT

O.K. We'll take you back a few years back in my younger days when I first started working I was in junior high school and I seem to remember one construction site out behind Willet Avenue where they were putting the flares. They run across a spot where the railroad had gone through and bulldozed and laid the tracks down in the Irish burial grounds from the poor houses. When the pits were dug for the flares the actual backhoe driver…I don't know whoever found him…because, as soon as he dug up a skull, he was gone. I was in there for nine days with a pair of tongs, picking up bones and throwing them up in a pile and then they were basically putting them in a big truck and taking them over into a big burial pit. Is that going to happen again if we run across a historical or First Nations grave site or something of this nature?

GREG GILLIS

Well, that's precisely why we have the protocol in place to avoid that kind of scenario…

VERN M. GARNETT

We'll be able to have a truck on your watch…

GREG GILLIS

Thank you…

VERN M. GARNETT

I'd like to be able to hear the answers on the water protection and also if you go up Debly Avenue there's a little….there's a sedimentary pond…it's our frog pond; it's been there…all the children go up there and watch the frogs. There's always an oil skim. I've asked people to check it out and they say it's just the swamp water. This is not a swamp it's just a depression where they bulldozed it out and I think it's coming up from the pipeline. I'd also like to see the video of the pipeline if possible…of the test sites. I'd like to ask Nelson …I've been to the river where they're going to be doing must of this mining of the Orimulsion® and fished there and it was a heavy jungle. Would it be possible to get a video tape of the area where you're doing your mining and your pumping? To see what kind of an area taking out…you've told me before…but, to visually see it. Would it be possible? O.K. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Mr. Garnett. That was the last of the registered presenters, if there are people who would like to approach the mikes and make general comments or questions, the floor is open to you.

DAVID THOMPSON

David Thompson again…I would like to request…you can never be too sure of something even an environmental impact study, but I would like to be assured at the meeting in Lorneville that there will be brought there a very large screen television, because we have at least one section of video we want to show at the meeting. So, I would like a large screen and the acoustics in the building are not good either. I want everybody in the room to be able to hear the video. So, if you could get someone to check out the sound there ahead of time and bring the proper sound equipment so we'll be able to use our material that evening…I would be most pleased.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Have you sir, made that request…

DAVID THOMPSON

Yes, I mentioned it to Germaine Pataki-Thériault at least a month ago, but I just wanted to ensure that tonight…to ensure that happened. Sometimes you know just for one reason….

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Is the person here who is responsible for the set up…

MICHELLE DAIGLE

….I just wanted to note that the system that we use for PowerPoint works for video as well. We just switch the laptop with the VCR….

DAVID THOMPSON

…so we can put in…

MICHELLE DAIGLE

…yep, your VCR and it will be projected on the same screen using that…

DAVID THOMPSON

That should be O.K. That should be fine…

MICHELLE DAIGLE

…And, it will be through the microphone system as well.

DAVID THOMPSON

Yeh, the Lorneville building, I noted from being there before that the sound is not particularly good in that building. It's not nearly as good as it is in this building. I don't know why it maybe just the make up of the walls or something. But, the ceiling is fairly low, maybe as low as the supports going over the top of this ceiling and we should have a look at that building and make sure there's enough speakers around the room so that everybody in the room can hear what's being said. As I mentioned, in my view the sounds in the room are not very contusive to people hearing good sound in the room. Someone ….you know…there's lot of people around Saint John that do acoustic work, so someone could go down and have a look at that sometime…you know perhaps tomorrow or Monday in the day time. That would be most helpful.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Ms. Daigle, I believe you were there today.

MICHELLE DAIGLE

Ah yeh, what we'll do is we'll ask the technicians that kind of set up the room to take that into consideration when considering the Lorneville Community Centre.

DAVID THOMPSON

I don't know if there's anyone else in the room tonight who's been in the Lorneville hall lately, there maybe someone else who can confirm what I'm saying or might be able to even provide a little more beneficial advice than I can. I'm certainly no expert on sound, except making it sometimes.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I'm sure everything will be done to make sure that people who will be there have a full opportunity to participate and to hear what others have to say.

DAVID THOMPSON

I was interested in one of Mr. Gillis's responses that Vern Garnett that there would be less vibration…I was wondering what he meant by that? I know there isn't an Orimulsion®, there's already a pipeline there which gives a lot of vibration. But it would seem that any additional pipelines and there may be two of there…so may have to look at cumulative effect…but, why would there be less vibration when two other pipelines…will those other pipelines mitigate the vibration of the existing one? Or will they have no vibration?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Can you answer that?

GREG GILLIS

Sure. My understanding is that it's just simply easier to pump that's all.

DAVID THOMPSON

But, but, but…

GREG GILLIS

The thing if someone designs something knowing that its going to vibrate…in our experience in any rate…you take that into consideration and you work it out…I mean you don't want a vibrating pipeline.

DAVID THOMPSON

I mean nobody wants a vibrating pipeline…I'm sure that if we have vibrating pipelines it causes all kinds of problems including structural ones in the joints and that and that sort of thing. But, I didn't understand what you said I guess when you said there would less vibration…I was wondering what you meant. O.K. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you again. Anyone else? Yes madam. Could you give your name please?

DORTHY DAWSON

My name is Dorothy Dawson. I live here in the City of Saint John and I have some comments and some questions. First of all when I came in here tonight, because I live here I know where this room is…there's nothing in the lobby that tells somebody that has not been in this hotel before where this meeting was taking place. I think that's hopefully part of the reason for some of the empty chairs.

The current stack is 600 feet. Did I understand you to say there will be a second stack?

GAETAN THOMAS

Yes.

DORTHY DAWSON

So, there'll be two stacks spewing out stuff?

GAETAN THOMAS

No.

DORTHY DAWSON

Why not?

GAETAN THOMAS

We will running on the new stack.

DORTHY DAWSON

So the other stack is just going to be there because it's cheaper to leave it than take it done.

GAETAN THOMAS

It will serve a duel function. You will need it on start-up, but that's it. It will have a very low, practically no use.

DORTHY DAWSON

O.K. And, the gypsum that's the by-product, you said it's…I'm not sure how you worded it…it's disposed of. What exactly do you mean by disposed of?

GAETAN THOMAS

A very large portion of the gypsum will be recycled…

DORTHY DAWSON

Where?

GAETAN THOMAS

…in the gypsum industry. We'll have contract in place to bring it back, whether its overseas or whether its in local industries…

DORTHY DAWSON

So, there going to make wallboard to put in somebody's house.

GAETAN THOMAS

Yes.

DORTHY DAWSON

And, do we know what's in that gypsum besides gypsum?

GAETAN THOMAS

Yes, there will be some very specific criteria and the quality of the gypsum will be measured before it goes out.

DORTHY DAWSON

So it won't have lead or mercury or any of those things a person wouldn't want in their house.

GAETAN THOMAS

It will be safe to be put in the houses.

DORTHY DAWSON

According to who's criteria?

GREG GILLIS

Before it would be accepted by the person who is considering buying the product, it has to meet standards. And, that's the same situation that's going on now for Belledune and other places that are marketing their gypsum through NB Power.

DORTHY DAWSON

I think the experience of the people of New Brunswick is that the standards are so low that just about anything could meet the standards. It doesn't make it safe to use.

Regarding the water, I had occasion to speak to somebody who works out there in the Musquash Watershed, who told me that last winter it was necessary to open the gates from Musquash Watershed into Spruce Lake, because of the lack of water (clapping)…now you're talking about doubling the two million gallons a day to run this dreadful fuel that you're planning on and you're saying that it won't have any effect on the Saint John water supply?

GREG GILLIS

The question that was….the concern was is the refurbished operation going to put pressure on the existing water supply and the existing water supply can easily handle the increased requirement for the new plant.

DORTHY DAWSON

Who says?

GREG GILLIS

The City of Saint John.

DORTHY DAWSON

Oh! But, the people who live out there and work out there tell me that they had to open the flood gates to let water into Spruce Lake last winter…because, we had practically no precipitation.

GREG GILLIS

But, it's a common practise to shift from the Musquash Watershed over to the Spruce Lake Watershed…

DORTHY DAWSON

It's not that common sir…that was why it became a topic of discussion because it's unusual.

GREG GILLIS

The system has been designed to handle that specific event and we have a lot of period of record of showing that indeed has taken place.

DORTHY DAWSON

So will be the numbers of litres of water or gallons of it that are going to through the new set up when its done?

GREG GILLIS

It's about an additional 4,000 cubic metres per day required for the refurbished project at

Coleson Cove.

DORTHY DAWSON

Plus the two million that's already going through?

GREG GILLIS

The additional….it's pretty close…it's another 4,000 cubic metres, roughly.

DORTHY DAWSON

So many gallons is a cubic metre?

GREG GILLIS

Now you got me…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Now we're going to have to get some calculations with that.

DORTH DAWSON

O.K. I have one more besides the business of the vehicles and the noise. I had occasion to be out by the oil refinery the other day. I couldn't believe the amount of noise just driving down the street past it. My question is a review committee was mentioned of people who don't have a vested interest like the people that are here tonight. I would like to know who the people are on this review committee.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Ms. Pataki-Theriault…

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Actually its quite a view people…I had listed at the beginning of my presentation the different agencies that are reviewing this document or that have reviewed this document. In those…for example, the Department of Environment and Local Government…it's not just…

DORTHY DAWSON

I need names…

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Absolutely….and Mr. Thompson asked for the same thing and I was able to provide that to him. What happens is that in each Department there are different groups that look at it. O.K. from the engineers to the air quality specialists in the Sciences & Planning Branch to people who look at the watershed to people who look at the wellfield protection area, to people in the Sustainable Planning Branch. So, we have a lot of people and I can certainly give you those names. In the case of the other department for example natural resources, they have everybody from the Energy Secretariat to the Regional Biologist to Fish & Wildlife Biologist, Wetlands Specialists and all kinds of people looking at it. They have a kind of review committee internally as well. I'm privy to…I know who those people are. In the case of Environment Canada for example, I wouldn't know who all those people are. They have a central contact who is Stephen Zwicker with Environment Canada and….

DORTHY DAWSON

So these people are meeting among themselves and then their sending a report to a central place?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

What we do is we send the report to each of the I guess…organize to each of the Departments and those people in turn funnel the information off to appropriate agencies within their own department. For example, Environment Canada they have a spill response group, they have CWS, which is a Canadian Wildlife Service. They have mandates for protecting birds and wetland and terrestrial environment. There are host of people that look at air quality from Environment Canada. So, there are a host of people in each department that looks at the report.

DORTHY DAWSON

How many people that actually live in the area of Coleson Cove are on that committee.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

We have no people from the area, the Coleson Cove area. We have…the purpose of the Technical Review Committee is to have technical experts that are engineers, wetland biologists, fisheries specialists…

DORTHY DAWSON

Is this the same people that got the New Brunswick Power Commission into the mess its in today?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

We have people who are highly specialized that do what they do…

DORTHY DAWSON

Too highly specialized…what we're looking for is how does this affect these people who live in this house, this distance from that Coleson Cove plant…this distance from that pipeline…this distance from that water supply. That's what we need to have bring their opinions and their experience this supposed unbiased committee.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

We do have the City of Saint John, who is a local authority obviously, who has been part of the review committee, as well as the Port of Saint John and other local groups as well. The Saint John Pilot Authority…

DORTHY DAWSON

(laughs)

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

You're right there are no local people on the review committee and …..

DORTHY DAWSON

I see that, that's what I'm asking you…why not?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Because they're not…

DORTHY DAWSON

And, please don't tell me we have no expertise because we're not engineers, because I'm tired of hearing that one. We have expertise because we live here and we put with the conditions that are brought about by these different wonderful projects that are supposed to solve all the problems of the world. And, I haven't seen them solve one yet.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Is that a statement or would you like me to say just one tiny little thing? (laughs) (clapping) I'll give you the list and perhaps I can get your address as well. I just wanted to add one little thing…I've lost it here…was that the stakeholder consultation as part of this review included people that were from the local community.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. Mr. Thompson I believe…

DAVID THOMPSON

To follow up on that question are any of the Technical Review Committee here tonight?

GERMAIN PATIKI- THÉRIAULT

Yes, they are.

DAVID THOMPSON

Who's here?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

O.K. I can introduce them if you'd like…we have Darwin Curtis here…actually perhaps they'd like to introduce themselves. Go ahead Darwin…

DARWIN CURTIS

My name is Darwin Curtis. I'm the Director of the Energy Secretariat within the Department of Natural Resources & Energy.

JOHN GRIGGS

My name is John Greigs. I work in the Resource Approvals Section of the Mines Branch of the Department of Natural Resources & Energy. My role really commences when we have an application to license the operation of the pipeline.

RANDY PIERCEY

I'm Randy Piercey, Manager of the Air Sciences Section, Sciences & Reporting Branch Department Environment & Local Government.

SEAN FULLERTON

Good evening, I'm Sean Fullerton, the Air Emissions Specialist with the Department of Environment.

ED VYE

My name is Ed Vye. I'm the Port Engineer with the Saint John Port Authority.

PETER TURNER

My name is Peter Turner. I'm the Harbour Master of Saint John and responsible for safe movement of vessels and to a certain extent the environmental protection under the various agencies.

SUSAN ATKINSON

I'm Susan Atkinson. I'm the Regional Director of Region 4 – that's the Fundy Region for the Department of Environment & Local Government. I also had a staff person on the Technical Review Committee

GAVIN INSLEY

I'm Gavin Insley and I'm the Manager of the Saint John Office of Transport Canada.

FAYE CAMPBELL

I'm Faye Campbell and I'm with the Canadian Coast Guard in Dartmouth, Environmental Response.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Sorry, I just wanted to point out that Mr. Ted Currie who is a Habitat Manager and Specialist with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans was here earlier and he has since left.

DAVID THOMPSON

That would be most helpful at the next meeting if that was sort of announced at the start who was here then if there were any particular points that anyone wanted to address on a particular subject…it would seem much more appropriate to address concerns to someone with the government department who has some responsibility rather than to the promoter of the Project or his consultants, who are hired to promote the Project for him or to assess the Project under his guidance. I mean that's a lot of the concern about the process here as I mentioned before and I don't want to belay that point again, but you know it's very disturbing to look up and see a panel of people who are largely, the majority comprised of the proponent and three other people, one who's chairing and a couple of others who really aren't there to address concerns or questions or to clarify things.

And, it's a major problem and if this process persists like this we can only continue to expect the quality of the environmental assessments that we've had in the past. I can certainly point to the many projects around the city…one I point to is the Irving Lagoon for the Irving

Rothesay, formerly Macmillan Mill out there…and, that particular project and after that was approved in that kind of format…made the lives very miserable for a lot of people who live close by on Midwood Avenue. They're people who came to meetings I was afterwards crying because they were having so many problems with their health and quality of life there. And, I think if this process continues…if this kind of process continues where you know the only concern we have is addressing people's questions rather than getting at the real concerns. Public relations from proponents and consultants who want to put a good face on their project to achieve government approval of it then the process is sorely lacking.

And, that's what we have and would concur very strongly with the earlier Conservation Council slide. And, I guess I've probably reviewed many more, or more environmental impact assessments than most people probably in this room, just because I've been around the environmental assessment for longer. I guess approaching some 25 years. I have yet to read an environmental assessment, particularly one done by NB Power or any part of it done by consultants, which they hired, which was critical of the project or recommended not going forward with any component or part of that project. I find it difficult to believe after all those years and all those assessments that something isn't wrong that every project that comes up…that if it gets that kind of response, you know from the people who are hired to do the work for it. And, I don't concur with what the consultants have said about themselves tonight, the self praise that was given to them of their motives and them doing the work that they do. We certainly don't agree with that and we certainly don't feel that it is proper for consultants to be on a kind of environmental assessment panel and I use the term loosely to call it that I guess. Anyways there's got to be change. Thank you. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you again sir. Yes….

GORDON DALZELL

I'd like to make a comment of the Technical Review Committee process. I really believe that it's really important to have some public input into that process. We recognize that it's a technical specialized group, but there is a good example where the Government of New

Brunswick did utilize public NGO's or public people in a very specialized type of committee and that was with the Management Committee for the Public Health Risk Assessment. That was developed by the Department of Health and Wellness at the time. And, there were two committee members, one in fact that is here…Sandra Thibodeau tonight and Judy LeBlanc were public citizen members, who sat on that kind of specialized technical committee that oversaw that special Public Health Risk Assessment. So, I would urge the Department to open up that process. It's really important to have public people present to (A) observe, (B) keeps people focused on the ground issues and the real issues as Mrs. Dawson had pointed out, not that you're not going to try and do that. But, to have people there that are living and experiencing these projects. We ask that that process be reviewed.

The other final point I want to make about the water study that Mrs. Dawson had brought up. I did do my own special homework. I contacted the Department of Water for the City of Saint John here, because if you look at that study, the water review study there…did you notice that the evaluation you did in order to draw the conclusions only included up to year 1990. You looked at all the water demands from 1970, 80, it stopped at 1990. Now, the last 10 years we've seen drought…well last year in 2001 we saw almost drought conditions here. We also saw precipitation…rain amounts being lower. The last 10 years have been quite tricky in terms of the precipitations and the weather conditions. So, I would like to see that study…you go back and take the data from the last 10 years there and then draw a conclusions and let's see what the numbers are based on the volume, the amount of water, etc.

And the final point about water is the City of Saint John just completed a serious water supply crisis here last year….or last week with two big major water mains bursting. There was a city councillor in the City of Fredericton, who was on the radio and he said, quote: "this would never happen in the City of Fredericton", this situation that happened in Saint John. And, I heard him say and I'd like the Technical Review Committee to check this out, he said: "we don't have the big heavy industrial users like they do in Saint John." So the question is with this water demand…

((END OF TAPE 2/SIDE 4)) 10:19 P.M.

…with this going in for the Orimulsion® project…what impact is it going to have on the infrastructure of the whole piping system and the water piping system that we saw in Saint John. You know, which went through quite a serious crisis here. Now, I did do some homework myself on this and they assured me that this Coleson Cove water line is a separate line, it's a separate line, apparently it's not suppose to be part of the City's water system. However, I would like to see the Technical Review Committee put that…study that issue, get the information that I got on the phone in talking with the water department and put it into public record and review what happened in Saint John last week and take a look at the water study in that context. Lot of people are worried that this drawn demand of additional water is really going to have long term impacts on the vulnerable water system, pipe system here in Saint John. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you. Are there any other comments or questions at this time? Sir, would you state your name please?

WINSTON WILSON

Winston Wilson, I live in Lorneville…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Do you want to speak into the mike please?

WINSTON WILSON

I live in Lorneville. I thought things were going fairly well until one statement that was brought out here just a minute ago. Were there any people from Lorneville on the committee? No, we need technical people. I don't think anyone in Lorneville was ever asked. There are a lot of technical people in Lorneville, engineers down there. No one was asked, but I'm going to ask a few questions and make a few statements. O.K. First question is if you pumped that ash out over Lorneville for so many years, how do we believe anything that's in this paper? One question. What type of fuel do you use right now? What type? Does anybody know? What are you using to burn down there?

CHARLES HICKMAN

We currently burn heavy fuel oil, otherwise known as # 6 or bunker seed.

WINSTON WILSON

# 6…do you use low sulphur?

CHARLES HICKMAN

No, it averages about 2.75 to 3% sulphur.

WINSTON WILSON

Now…one comment was made here, and I see it many evenings going home to my home. It's a neat village, a quiet village and we pay our taxes and you try to keep your home up, you cut your grass, you wash your cars…you be a good neighbour and, then someone pumps that over you all night. I go home and it looks like a bomb has exploded at Coleson Cove with the plume that's coming out of there. It's not white. It's just brownish, grey…and, it's pumped not at 3 O'clock in the afternoon, but at 5 or 6. Now you can't tell me you're not burning a different fuel at night time than you are during the daytime. Something's wrong and you've been doing it.

The other thing is if you were going to put a monobuoy out in the Bay down off Lorneville, how long is it going to take to unload a ship?

CHARLES HICKMAN

Approximately 36 hours

WINSTON WILSON

36 hours…how much per hour to put that tug boat on the end of it to hold it tot. Any idea?

CHARLES HICKMAN

Sorry, I missed the question…

WINSTON WILSON

If you're going to put a large vessel down there you're going to have to hold it straight at all times into the wind, into the waves, how much is it going to cost per hour to hold it out there?

CHARLES HICKMAN

I don't know what the cost per hour is. The way the monobouy operates is the tanker swings with the wind so it would take around on the monobouy, so we don't have to hold it per say, the wind holds it there.

WINSTON WILSON

Really. O.K. Because when they we're going to put the LPG terminal in Lorneville, there was no way they could build anything that could hold a ship. That was why it didn't go there. That was one thing. They were going to try and build a breakwater; they knew the breakwater would break.

The other thing is you have 1700 and some vehicles going in and out of there…one way into Lorneville…one way out. That's not right. That is definitely a wrong. Even in fire codes you have to have two ways of escape. You only have one. With that amount of vehicles going in there…you never made the plan, how in the heck would you know? You don't even know.

The other part is you read in here that you can carry 62,500 kilograms without weight restrictions. That's wrong. You can only have 100% weight restrictions on the Trans Canada Highway when the weight restrictions go on…it's 80% off-roads. So, and it says it's not going to ruin the highways. It will ruin the highways, I'm telling you. You just come up from the Harbour Bridge and see the dips in the road coming up there in the rain. That's done by trucks. I know trucks because I work for a trucking company. I know what they can carry. I know their weight restrictions and all that so…but, the point is I wouldn't have been fired up until we weren't technically good enough in Lorneville. That's not good. Don't make statements like that …that is a poor, poor atmosphere, especially when you want us to believe want you're going to do. That doesn't work and I don't think that will carry too well in Lorneville Tuesday night. That's unfair. That is unfair.

I just want to say that I think there's a few other things…sorry, but I wrote a few things down here….I realized this evening that you have all kinds of technical support here, but who looked after Lorneville all the years you dumped the ash? Nobody…nobody…now you want to make it right. That's a poor, poor thing. If you lived there and you knew and you dependent on a neighbour…that's what we looked as NB Power on as a neighbour, nothing else…but, then to find that you had things to make it better and didn't. That's poor. If someone came to me and told me fix your house, I would fix it to make it better. And, that's about all I have to say, whether I'll be there Tuesday night…I may, but I just don't like the idea that we're not good enough. (clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you sir…

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

I certainly didn't mean to imply that Sir…

(WINSTON WILSON'S VOICE IN THE BACKGROUND)

…see that's a statement that's made that comes out...

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

What I meant to say was that the Technical Review Committee consists of experts. We have those experts to review the document. Now the second part of the EIA is to have the public review the document. It's good that you have people that are really able to have a good look at the document, but the Technical Review Committee perspective, the precedent has been set in the past where the people who ask to comment on the reports have been people from other Departments.

DORTHY DAWSON

(HER VOICE IN THE BACKGROUND)….but the citizens who want to have input have no funding to have those documents looked at and have input, because of the way that the system is structured. It sucks.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Is there any further comments or questions at this time?

DAVID THOMPSON

Yeh, I'd like to touch on that point too, because we haven't mentioned that in the meeting yet except in just a general way. There's a strong need in these environmental processes for intervener funding. As I mentioned if we had the money that was spent for the representative of Bitor to fly between Florida and here for all the trips he's made…if we had 10% of that money, I think that we could…that amount of money, we could do a much better analysis of the EIA document that we have. Now the amount of people that are this room and the amount of money that they've been paid in their companies by NB Power, it puts…if we were to have a graph, we would have the proponents, the promoters of the Project who are trying to sell it to the government. And, that's what this really is, it's a sell job. And, we'd have a graph with their resources and money somewhere up here and I think if we had ours it might be down here, perhaps even lower, we might have to find some kind of magnifying glass to find that. And I know what kind of resources the Conservation Council has to put into this. And I think that the Conservation Council has had more than all of the other environmental groups put together…and I like I say you'd have to have a kind of magnifying glass if you compare their money spent…the Power Commission's on their own people and their consultants to do the sell job of this to government and the public. And I mean the public too. There's been lots of public meetings around. I've seen quarter and half page ads in the Telegraph Journal. I'm sure we would have liked to have one too to acquaint the public with the other side of the story. But, I'm afraid you know, there wasn't the resources to do that. And there's a need to balance…I mean if we're going to get quality environmental assessments…if we're going to get quality projects, if we're going to get quality in the way business is carried out in the Province, then we have to have all of the information on the table. And we have to have both sides of the picture and the ability of the people on both sides to present it. Not only those with a narrow business interest. And in this case where it involves the Power Commission, it's even more disgusting when it's being done by a crown corporation, one that's being paid by taxpayers and ratepayers. I mean it's much worse than a private company. I guess I wouldn't be saying some of things that I'm saying right now if it were a private company, but when we see a crown corporation and one that indeed has a government minister somewhere there in the background…we're not quite sure there now because situation keeps changing. But who's constantly, or they have in the past, constantly made excuses for NB Power and defended them in the House and everywhere else in public… that we're seeing a situation…that we're being ruled by the narrow business and corporate interests of NB Power and their ability to spend our money, which comes into them in the form of rates and taxes and support to spend it…to dictate to the people of the Province what's going to happen and unless there's a way to balance that and balance the information so we get a complete picture there…a picture that has some degree of balance on it…then we're not going to get good decision making no matter how hard we try. So, I know it's never going to be completely balanced, but there's a need. And there's a need for a strong recommendation from someone involved with this environmental assessment now to provide intervener funding, certainly for any larger projects that occur in the Province, certainly when it involves projects of half a billion dollars or more, there's a need for intervener funding. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. sir (clapping)

GORDON DALZELL

Just for the record I want to reinforce David Thompson's point about intervener funding. Just for us for example, to prepare our written summary, we are out of respect for people going to have it typed…I mean I can not type that fast…I'm sorry enough to say, so we are going to have engage to have it typed. So, it's probably going to cost $80. It's important for you to know that in order for us to participate and to present, we hope valued comments on this process…we've literally had to through some other members help us with fundraising, bottle collecting, collecting hubcaps off the street. It's unbelievable just so that we can participate and present our comments, which of course we've been doing for years. So it's important to realize how hard it is for sincere public interest groups and the citizens to try to participate in a process that you value. So there has to be some kind of system to cover the expenses that are legitimate, whether it's long distance phone calls we have to make, etc…I don't' want to belabour it…it's not just fair. I think the proponent and others have massive resources.

Now there is...well, anyway...the final point I want to make about fuel delivery out in Canaport. As you know, about two years ago, the large, very large crude oil tanker, the Primrose and I want the Technical Review Committee to get all the documentation on this...there was an incident about two to three years ago where there was a collision or it came in contact with either a pier or some other object. The ship was punctured. It was a publicly recognized event. It was very worrisome and the information I received today and I want the Technical Review Committee to look at...that even though that was a double-hulled ship, it came within two feet of penetrating the next hull. It came very close...two feet I understand from the second hull being punctured and I believe it had a million gallons of crude oil in it. To say that it has been transported without incident...yes, that's up to this point. But right in this study area, right at Canaport itself, two to three years ago, a very significant and worrisome event took place. So we would ask the Technical Review Committee to get all of the documentation on that and to review that extremely carefully if you haven't already. If it happened once, you're getting into the statistics of potentials even though it has double-hulled ships. And we also understand that perhaps some of these ships don't always have double-hulls. Anyway that's for another meeting...thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Did you want to make a comment?

CHARLE HICKMAN

Just wanted to make one clarification Gordon...the vessels we will use, will be double-hulled vessels.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you if there are no further comments...perhaps there ...are there any final words from the people from the Environment and Local Government? Anything else?

PERRY HAINES

I just wanted to say that all these comments that have been made on the process; they're a matter of public record. They will be carried forward and you have been heard on those and we will carry them forward.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Well, I'd like to thank everyone on behalf of the Minister of the Environment and Local Government for coming this evening to make your views known. Obviously a lot of important work has been done on behalf of the citizens of the local area and I will make your views known about the process from the Chair as you requested to the Minister. I will point out the views that were made out tonight on that process, with the understanding that the people that were here this evening followed the process that is now in the regulations and it is up to the Minister and Cabinet to make the changes…really it's not the people who are here this evening who can do that.

There will be another meeting next Tuesday, July 30 in Lorneville and if you wish to attend of course, you are most welcome. In addition, you have the opportunity to make additional comments in writing for a period of 15 days following the last public meeting, which would bring us to August 14. There are forms provided, although you do not need to use these forms, the forms are provided for you and they are available at these tables over here. So, if you wish to make your comments and leave them here this evening they will be taken to the minister, or obviously you're free to mail them yourselves to the Minister. Again, I would like to thank you and I adjourn this meeting.

((END OF TAPE 3/SIDE 1)) 10:38 P.M.

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PUBLIC MEETING JULY 30, 2002 AT THE LORNEVILLE COMMUNITY CENTRE, SAINT JOHN

TO DISCUSS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE NB POWER COLESON COVE GENERATING STATION REFURBISHMENT PROJECT

Prepared by:
Department of Environment & Local Government

New Nouveau Brunswick
Environment and Local Government

JULY 30, 2002

7 P.M.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

....sit in the front rows here for those of you who might like to do that. Again, it is 7 O'clock and I will call the meeting to order.

I am pleased to welcome you on behalf of the Minister of the Environment and Local Government, to this second public meeting of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the NB Power Coleson Cove Refurbishment Project. My name is Emery Goguen and I'll be chairing tonight's meeting. I live in Bathurst and I'm not employed by the Department of Environment and Local Government who administered the Legislation by which this meeting is called or I'm not employed either by the proponent NB Power.

This Minister has called this public meeting as required under the Province's Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation to provide interested members of the public an opportunity to discuss the EIA report prepared by NB Power. The first meeting was held on July 25 at the Coastal Inn. My role this evening is to ensure that there is an orderly meeting, and to make sure that the discussions themselves take place in an atmosphere where everyone who wishes to make a point, present comments, or ask questions is given the opportunity to do so.

Based on last week's meeting, it is evident that there are some comments, concerns or ideas surrounding the process, the public process itself. These have all been noted and will be duly considered by the Department. Tonight, however, is not the forum for these kinds of discussions or comments and I have been asked by the Department to encourage you to communicate with Departmental Staff during the break, after the meeting, or at a later date by phone or in writing if you have such concerns about the public meeting process. Tonight we're here to listen to your comments, questions and concerns regarding the specifics of Coleson Cove Refurbishment Project. I will thank you for respecting that.

I'd like to begin by introducing the individuals who are seated with me this evening. On my left are representatives of the Department of the Environment and Local Government. Perry Haines is the Director of the Project Assessment Branch of the Department......Germaine Pataki-Theriault, a Project Manager in the Project Assessment Branch, is the Chairperson of the Technical Review Committee. The Technical Review Committee is the panel, which has reviewed the EIA study and prepared some General Review Statements as a result of that.

On my right are representatives of NB power, which is the proponent in this assessment. Charles Hickman is the Manager of Environmental Assessment and Assurance, Gaetan Thomas is the Project Director, and Greg Gillis is Vice-President of AMEC, which is a consulting firm.

Before we go any further, I'd like to mention that we received the names of individuals that wish to make a presentation tonight and these are listed on the flip chart, which is against the wall over here. Anyone else who wishes to make a formal presentation should approach one of the Public Consultation staff members at the back of the room in order to have your name added to the list. These staff members are also here to assist you if you need documents or have process-related questions.

In an effort to allow everyone an opportunity to speak, we will try to keep individual comments/questions to 15 minutes each. Please note however, there is the opportunity for anyone who wishes to go back to the microphone and complete a presentation or whatever…to do so if they wish to do that or if they wish to make additional comments or ask questions. And, those who wish to have more than one comment are certainly welcome to approach the microphone more than once. So at the end of 15 minutes if you're a speaker, I will try to give you a bit of a signal to try to let you find a natural break so that you can stop and perhaps finish your comments later in the meeting, then you can pick up where you left off. I also ask you to respect this so everyone who wants to speak will have an opportunity to do so.

I will be calling on the presenters according to the order on the list, except one and two will be switched at their own request. And I will allow time in between for questions or comments from others. I'm going to do that until about 8:00 O'clock. At around 8 O'clock in order to accommodate individuals that may have other commitments, who want to have an opportunity to make some general comments or questions from the floor, you will be given an opportunity at 8 O'clock and that will occur until about 8:30 at which time we will have a break. After the break we will resume with registered presentations. At the end of the session with the registered presenters, again people will have the opportunity to make general comments and questions. Our aim is to adjourn this meeting at 10:30, 11 O'clock. But we are prepared to stay later if needed in order to hear from everyone that wants to be heard.

I'd also like to note that simultaneous interpretation services are available and if you wish to use it, headphones are available at the back of the room. You should also know that the proceedings are also being recorded in order to prepare transcripts, verbatim and a Summary of Public Consultations for presentation to the Minister. So I'd ask that you identify yourselves as you approach the microphone. And, I would also ask you to avoid speaking too quickly, like I'm doing right now, in order to assist the interpreters and the people who will be doing the transcribing.

Everyone should note also that this is a non-smoking venue and would ask that you comply with this requirement. The rest rooms are located at the back at the left of the translation booth at the back.

We will begin the meeting now with brief introductory remarks from….who's going to be first?.....you…so, first remarks will be from NB …sorry…

PAT DONOVAN

Is it possible that some of the young people may give up chairs to some of the seniors who don't have a place to sit down?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I would hope so…so, the request is there are people who may need some chairs…who would like to have some chairs…there are still a few chairs available here…and, there are people who might be willing to give up their seats so that those who need them more may have them. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Donovan. There are still a few empty chairs, 5, 6, 7 empty chairs up at the front here in the first couple of rows here on my left.

GAETAN THOMAS

Technical, the technical guy…it's not working…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

We have a bit of a technical difficulty. Is there a technician that's a…can…I guess all we needed was to push the on button.

GAETAN THOMAS

Good evening… What are the Orimulsion® project rationales or drivers? One is we have to make environmental improvements, particularly on SO_2 at Coleson Cove by 2005. Two, Coleson Cove represents a 1000 MW of reliable supply of energy for our customer in the Province, especially during the winter. And three, we want to contribute to stable energy rates for our customers.

All three units at Coleson Cove were constructed in the mid 70's and met the environment requirements of the time. To meet today's stricter environmental requirement an upgrade is needed. We did look at alternatives. One alternative to Orimulsion® is a blended oil option. This is a 1 and 3% blended heavy fuel oil operation. This operation would be more costly, but also would not make the same environmental gains as the Orimulsion® project. We considered natural gas and based on the volatility of price and the economics, and there was also some questions about availability…. we did not penalize the Project based on potential unavailability or unsecured supply of natural gas and it still didn't make the requirements.

Now what is involved in the upgrade and the conversion? We plan to install a scrubber to reduce the sulphur dioxide emissions. A wet electrostatic precipitator to reduce fine particulate emissions, including ultra fine particulates vanadium, mercury, SO_3. We also will do extensive boiler modifications and replace a whole combustion equipment system to add low NO_x burners and a reburn system to allow switching from heavy oil to Orimulsion® and to control our NO_x emissions. As part of this process…we started this process last year…we had over 50 meetings, over 1100 people attended our sessions. We had public meetings in Lorneville, Musquash, Saint John over a year ago. We also received some Guidelines from the Department of Environment and Local Government, which had public input and it resulted in a number of component studies that we had to produce. We hired some consultants to help us with the component studies. They are from AMEC, ADI Limited, Jacques Whitford Environmental Limited and Golder Associates. Three of these consultants have local offices in Saint John and have a lot of experience world wide on environmental issues. The results of the component studies, I will briefly summarize.

We had a Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment Study, which is a comparison between heavy fuel oil and Orimulsion® in the Bay of Fundy. The results were reduced risk and reduced consequences in case of a spill. We also had an Air Quality Study, which clearly indicated that it would be major reductions in air emissions. We also conducted a Surface Water Study to ensure there would be enough water for the scrubber operation. The scrubber required water with limestone to produce gypsum, which is a fully marketable product. The Socioeconomic Study indicated that there would be a 100 full-time regular jobs maintained and up to 700 jobs during peak of construction and a lot of economic spin-offs for the area.

We also conducted a Human Health Risk Assessment Study and the results of the study are that there will be positive benefits to the general public. The Solid Waste Disposal Area of study was required and mainly it's for disposing of gypsum that could be off spec, however our experience in Dalhousie and Belledune indicates that we have been able to market 99.78% of the gypsum. We also had Fuel Delivery System Study where we had to look at a new pipeline from Canaport to the East Saint John area and then it will tie into the existing pipeline, which was fully investigated and tested to ensure its integrity for the next 30 years. We also had Transportation Study and Noise Study related to traffic during construction. Although there will be some increased construction activities and increased traffic as a result of construction, all the safety standards will be met and all the traffic concerns have been addressed.

Now what is Orimulsion®? It's a water based fuel. It's 30% water and 70% bitumen. Its composition is very similar to heavy fuel oil #6. Because it's a weathered fuel with much lower concentration of toxic hydrocarbons, it is less harmful to the environment. It is a non-flammable fuel. It won't sustain fire by itself. So, it's a safer fuel to handle. It flows better than fuel oil #6. It actually pours chocolate milk. And, it's used globally…for example in Italy, Japan and Denmark.

What kinds of emissions improvements are we talking about here? We're talking about 77% or better on sulphur dioxide. We're talking about 70% or better on NO_x, and we're talking about 75% or better on all kinds of particulate emissions, including fine particulates.

Now how we plan to accomplish these reductions is through pollution control equipment. They will substantially reduce emissions, all kinds of emissions such as fine particulate, including vanadium, nickel, mercury and SO_3. There will be significantly reduced from the existing operation of today and there are no new chemicals that would be emitted as a result of the Orimulsion® project. What happens if we had a control equipment failure is very clear and simple….the unit shuts down. This is a code out of a typical Condition of Approval from the New Brunswick Department of Environment and Local Government. We have these in place in Dalhouise and Belledune. "The Approval holder shall ensure that all air pollution control equipment is functional and is in operation at all times during which the facility is in operation."

The plume…the plume has been a long standing concern. In every one of those meetings it was brought up. What makes up the plume is a number of things. NO_x is one of the them, particulate is one of them and sulphur trioxide is another one of them. The long brown plume will be eliminated as a result of this Project. And, it will be replaced by a short cloud like white plume. How are we going to do that is going to be done through the wet electrostatic precipitator.

Now I'd like to talk about the Dalhousie experience. The Dalhousie experience when we did the conversion, we had significant improvements; we had significant reduction of SO_2, NO_x and particulate. We did not have a wet electrostatic precipitator. The sulphur trioxide that is remaining now is now the visible part on that plume at times. And, we added a wet electrostatic precipitator but it was after the fact, and by adding it after the fact we were limited in space, we had some constraints and we could only put a one stage electrostatic precipitator. We've learned from the experience and for this Project we are putting a three stage electrostatic precipitator upfront. There's no space constraint, there's no engineering constraint and we have guaranteed performance on SO_3, sulphur trioxide by 90% reduction. We know from Dalhouise that if we bring it down less than 10 parts per millions, we are able to have a clean white, cloud like plume. And we will do that for Coleson Cove. So there will be no purple haze.

I know there's been issues about spills and when we went to these public meetings over the last year, we had three options: Canaport, Pier 10 and the Coleson Cove Monobouy. Based on economic, environmental assessment and input from the local fishermen, we opted for a known operating facility at Canaport. The results of the study says there will be reduced probability of spills, because we have double-hulled ships, younger ships and much stricter vetting criteria on selecting the ships. There's also a reduced frequency of delivery from approximately 30 to 15 and with this NB Power will account for approximately 5% of the tanker traffic in the Bay of Fundy. Orimulsion® is much less toxic than heavy fuel oil #6 and as a result there will be reduced risks to the marine environment in the event of a spill. And, there will also be some spill response equipment and training available on site in case of a spill.

The Musquash Harbour is a very critical eco-system and many other eco-systems were evaluated and addressed with input from local stakeholders, such as marine biologists, local scientists, pilots, some personnel from the Irving Alert Response Organization, as part of the EIA. The results are clearly described in the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment. We've also discussed the issues and concerns in the Solid Waste Disposal Study. There are no wells affected and we're going to stay away from the streams and there will be no run-offs. It will be controlled back to the plant and retreated using our own waste treatment facility. The fuel system delivery report also is discussing all these valuable ecosystems.

We know there are also other additional community issues. One of them is the traffic on King William Road. We've done some studies. We've done some modelling. There are no safety hazards. The road system can handle what we're doing except we will have to add a traffic light on the exit 112 coming out from Saint John toward St. Stephen, turning left on King William Road. A traffic light will be added there. We will closely monitor the traffic. If there are any concerns throughout the construction project, we will address them and remediate as necessary.

The access to Black Beach is a concern…you know, and it's a lovely beach. We are going to allow traffic through the beach at all time through the Project. There might be some congestion issues. We might have to put flag personnel or provide some transportation. But, we will do that to minimize the disruption towards the traffic on Black Beach.

The Solid Waste Storage & Disposal Area has been a concern, however we have to remember here that 99.8.9.7% of that gypsum will be marketed back to the wallboard industries. It is a very marketable product. We've experienced it in Dalhousie, when we had our third scrubber in Canada and in Belledune where we had our first scrubber in Canada. And this would be our fourth scrubber in Canada or the third in New Brunswick.

As far as the availability of freshwater, the studies clearly indicate that the Spruce Lake system can handle it and as a result of this Project there will be ample employment opportunities for this Project.

So we are here to listen to your concerns first, we have brought our consultants who have authored the studies, in case you have any questions, specific questions…it's the time to ask them and we will try to answer every one of your concerns and questions. So, we're here to listen to you. Thank you very much for your attention.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much Mr. Thomas. The second person to make introductory remarks is Germaine Pataki-Thériault on behalf of Department of Environment and Local Government.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Thank you. Good evening, it's wonderful to see so many people turn out tonight. The Environmental Impact Assessment (or EIA) Regulation requires that all electric power generating facilities with a production rating of three megawatts or more, as well as modifications to these facilities must be registered with the Department of the Environment and Local Government and approved prior to commencing the project or the modifications. It was a year ago last July 25; NB Power submitted a request to refurbish the Coleson Cove Generating Station to burn Orimulsion® fuel. On October 31, 2001 it was determined that a full Environmental Impact Assessment would be required for this project.

An EIA is designed to identify significant environmental and socio-economic impacts and to establish mitigation measures to minimize these effects. The project that is submitted is reviewed as proposed. In this case, the economic regulator, the Public Utilities Board, determined last summer that there was in fact a need for 1050 MW of power at Coleson Cove, and as such NB Power has submitted this proposal to refurbish the Station. The EIA process does allow for an examination of alternatives for a project. The analysis of alternatives is, however, not to the same level of detail that is required for the proposed project.

As you know from the Summary and the General Review Statement that has been available to the public since June 26, the project submitted by NB Power has many components. It was suggested at last week's public meeting that since there are so many components; this project just doesn't make sense and should not be supported. One of the reasons that a full environmental impact assessment was required for this project was precisely because of the many components. The many pieces of this puzzle necessitate that more agencies and more expertise be required to review it. People have suggested that an independent agency should be hired by government at the taxpayers' expense to review the consultants' work. That is precisely the role of the multi-agency Technical Review Committee.

When a project is required to undergo a full EIA, a group of technical representatives is established to assist the process. The Technical Review Committee members for this Project have, since last year, identified significant issues for the EIA study, provided input into the design of the studies, participated in meetings, workshops and conference calls, critiqued the documentation, requested clarification, have asked pages and pages of questions and tasked NB Power to undertake further analysis. The Review Committee for this project included members of the New Brunswick Departments of Environment and Local Government, Natural Resources and Energy, Health and Wellness, Agriculture, Fisheries and Aquaculture, Transportation, the Culture and Sport Secretariat, and the Workers Health, Safety and Compensation Commission, the City of Saint John and the federal Departments of Fisheries and Oceans, Environment Canada, Transport Canada, the Saint John Port Authority and the Atlantic Pilotage Authority. Those members that are here this evening will be introduced after my introductory remarks.

Draft Guidelines were released to the public for input on November 15, 2001. Items identified for study included air quality, including greenhouse gases, examination of alternatives, potential impacts of a spill in the Bay of Fundy, increased marine vessel traffic, the integrity of the existing pipeline from Coleson Cove to the refinery, noise, air and safety impacts from increased vehicle traffic, potential impacts to the terrestrial environment and adequacy of the surface water supply at Spruce Lake.

The public's comments on the Guidelines were received until December 15, 2001. This was the opportunity for the public to say, upfront, what should and shouldn't be included in the EIA study upfront. While the public response we received was limited, those comments were very valuable and thanks to the Saint John Clean Air Coalition, the Final Guidelines included among other things, an analysis of impacts on human health, ensuring the endangered right whale was considered in the analysis of hypothetical spills, ensuring a broader analysis of alternatives and ensuring upset conditions were included in the air quality analysis.

Nine component studies were submitted to the Technical Review Committee in support of the EIA report, as mentioned by Gaetan Thomas. As I have previously mentioned, these were reviewed and I would like to point out that for all of the studies, it wasn't just one agency or individual providing comments, but various agencies typically have complementary mandates, ensuring a thorough analysis. As a result of deficiencies noted by the review committee, the Reports have been revised in order to satisfy the Guidelines.

The Technical Review Committee has concluded that the revised document submitted by NB Power addresses the issues identified by the Minister in the Guidelines and is therefore a satisfactory study on which to base a public discussion of this project. That is the purpose of this meeting this evening. A number of technical issues regarding design, construction, operation and spill response contingency planning remain to be resolved. The committee feels that these issues may be addressed in subsequent regulatory approval processes or as conditions to be applied to the Project as part of a final decision by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, if the Government of New Brunswick approves this project.

The Technical Review Committee generally agrees with the findings of the report. There are some uncertainties inherent in risk assessment and in modelling, but that is the nature of environmental assessment. It is a predictive tool used to make a decision and then the follow-up is critical to ensuring predictions are verified.

The committee feels the project could be constructed and operated in an environmentally acceptable manner, provided all mitigation measures recommended in the EIA report are incorporated into the project. It is important to note that the Technical Review Committee does not make the decision on this project. It provides technical expertise to the Minister of Environment and Local Government. It is imperative, from our perspective, that a thorough EIA review is undertaken and that the review agencies are satisfied with the documentation provided prior to going to the public.

Since June 26 we have been in the second part of the regulated public consultation phase; the first phase being the development of the study Guidelines. These public meetings provide you, the public, opportunity to seek clarification, ask questions, or just have your input documented for the public record. Perry, my boss and my roles here tonight are not as decision-making Panel members of a process like the Public Utilities Board Hearing or the Canadian Environmental Impact Assessment Panel Reviews. This project requires a Cabinet decision. I am the coordinator of the Technical Review Committee for this Project and I want to make sure that if people have questions about that review, that the technical review committee members here tonight or I can answer them. There are some questions that are most applicable to be answered by NB Power's consultants. I am here to ensure that the information that is being provided to you by NB Power and their consultants is in keeping with the information presented to the Technical Review Committee over the course of this last year.

As far as the remaining process is concerned, a further 15 days following the last public meeting, which would be August 14th would be the last of the 15 days, is offered for the public to submit written comments to the Minister. A Summary of Public Participation will be prepared, including a summary of the written briefs submitted to the Minister and the transcript of these meetings. This summary and the transcripts will be made publicly available and are analysed by the Minister. The summary of public participation will be included in the documentation sent to Cabinet for the decision making process.

Thank you and now I'd like to ask the TRC members that are present tonight to introduce themselves. Faye, I'll start with you…

FAYE CAMPBELL

My name is Faye Campbell. I'm with the Canadian Coast Guard Environmental Response.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Thank you.

ED VYE

Good evening, I'm Ed Vye. I'm a Port engineer with the Saint John Port Authority.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Thanks

GAVIN INSLEY

Good evening, my name is Gavin Insley. I'm with Transport Canada.

DEANNA MACCULLUM

My name is Deanna McCollum. I'm with the Department of Environment and Local Government at the Saint John Regional Office.

TED CURRIE

Good evening, my name is Ted Currie. I'm with Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Was there anyone else?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Sorry, one more person. Sorry John.

JOHN GRIGGS

Good evening, my name is John Griggs. I'm with the Mines Branch of the Department of Natural Resources & Energy. The Mines Branch deals with pipeline operating licenses.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much. I'd like to remind you that we are here this evening to hear from you. We realize there is a great interest in this Project, understandably and that the best way to ensure that your views are communicated to the Minister is by doing so in an orderly fashion so that everything can be recorded, and points can be well made and transmitted to the Minister. So, I thank you for that. Our first presenter is Marie Tremblay of… called the Friends of Musquash. I believe that was correct….

HELEN-MARIE TREMBLAY

Good evening Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, friends and neighbours, as the Chairperson has said, I'm Helen Marie Tremblay, Director and Secretary for Friends of Musquash Inc. I guess we had better take some time to spell it out tonight….such as the

Musquash Estuary and the Marine Protected Area Development have been completely ignored and left out of the Power Commission's environmental impact study…just who and what we are…

On January 25, 2000 the Musquash Estuary was accepted into the process to become a Marine Protected Area by Herb Dahliwal, of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, after being nominated by the Conservation Council of New Brunswick and the Fundy North Fishermen's Association. We would like to present the panel with a copy of the letter from Fisheries and Oceans, Mr. Herb Dahliwal sent on February 7, 2000 news releases confirming acceptance of the Musquash Estuary into the Marine Protected Area Program. (I'll leave them there for the moment) Over the past four years, extensive work has been carried in the Musquash Estuary with hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by both conservation groups, government agencies on research studies, mapping and land acquisition.

Amazingly, Friends of Musquash or Musquash Marine Protected Area Planning Group were never contacted during the environmental impact study by the New Brunswick Power, its consultants or the New Brunswick Environment Department. I would like now to present you with a little bit of information about Friends of Musquash. For the past few years community efforts have been under way to establish the Musquash Estuary as a Marine Protected Area (MPA). The Musquash Estuary remains the last major unpolluted estuary in the Bay of Fundy region. The estuary also contains the largest intact salt marsh on the New Brunswick side of the Bay of Fundy. We'd certainly like to keep it that way. The Marine Protected Area proposal is moving forward and has gained the endorsement of a number of large national and provincially based groups and agencies. Indeed, Musquash could become one of the first Marine Protected Areas in Canada.

Friends of Musquash was incorporated to be an organization in which individuals associations and communities in the Musquash area, take part in the protection and management of the Musquash Watershed and the Marine Protected Area. Friends of Musquash have the following mandates: to serve as advisory position to Fisheries and Oceans Canada and the other federal and provincial agencies with respect to the Musquash Marine Protected Area; to participate on the MPA Management Committee as established by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in developing, monitoring and amending as necessary the management plan for the

Musquash MPA; to serve as a vehicle, as a community liaison with various agents with respect to Musquash MPA; to serve as a watchdog on issues related to the Musquash Watershed; to carry out education, communication and community research and monitoring programs.

We are very concerned about the location of the proposed dump, or Solid Waste Management Area, and any other new development in the Shannon Watershed. Development in the Shannon Watershed will present a direct risk and ongoing threat to the Musquash Estuary and Marine Protected Area. Therefore, we'll oppose any development in the Shannon Watershed.

We have a short video, which profiles Shannon Watershed, lake and brook and its direct connection to Frenchman's Creek and its direct connection to the Musquash Estuary. The video is not narrated so I would ask David Thompson to explain what you are about to see. David?

DAVID THOMPSON

Thank you Mary. I'll just say a couple of words before he starts the video there, the video is very short, its only about 3 minutes in length and I'll try to narrate as I go along, but I think I should say a couple of words first. First of all, the area that we're going to look at is the area that the power commission is planning to establish the dump. We all know about dumps in the Lorneville area. This is the land that was formally expropriated for the community, which was told to the community that it would be given back to them if it wasn't used and of course it hasn't been used since that time of expropriation. Now, they want to build a dump there and also to do some other developments for parking in the area, which could lead to run-off, as well a lay down area. In fact they want to buy a total of 88 hectares from Business New Brunswick, which we're certainly not in favour of because we don't want any development there, because it could threaten the Marine Protected Area.

What you're going to see in the video…you're going to see what's in there, what the Shannon wetland and freshwater marsh is like. We're going to show the stream coming out of it, going down into Frenchman's Creek and then draining directly through a little waterfall into Frenchman's Creek, then Frenchman's Creek running into the Musquash Estuary. And, we believe there should be no development on those hillsides around the Musquash area of any kind. We know that mitigation measures will be put in place. We've heard the Power Commission talk mitigation a few moments ago. But, we know it doesn't always work and we know that it doesn't work forever and eventually these dump ceiling systems and draining systems don't work as they should and eventually it leaks into the environment and follows the course of gravity and goes where we don't want it to. Therefore, we're opposing any development there. So let's see the video and I'll try to narrate it as it goes along. Thank you.

(VIDEO BEGINS…)

We're just coming out of Musquash Harbour there and the plant is located as near as 2 kms to the Musquash Estuary. It's that near…Of course an overview shot of the Coleson Cove itself. Now the wetland we're talking about is north in behind those tanks in the woods there…you'll see it in just a moment.

Is there a problem? O.K. I guess we're starting…I'm not sure what's happening here. I expected something like this. We have another video there if this doesn't work.

Anyway we're looking at the area at the tanks and we can see off to the top there we can see where the start of the Shannon Lake is and part of that wetland and we can see where its running down into the stream leading out of it. And it's that near to the existing development already. So, it's already under threat. We certainly don't want anymore activity. Now we're right in the freshwater marsh at the head of Shannon Lake and we can see the stack and some of the tanks behind it. And off to left there we see a beaver house, there's beaver activity and obviously some mosquitoes that day I was filming it in there. The area has a fish population in it there that seems to be pretty good. I saw quite a few fish the day I was in there and there's one just jumping in the picture now.

We're seeing now an overhead, an area photograph of the stream coming down out of that area and running down towards Frenchman's Creek and that's a close up of the lower end of the marsh where the stream starts out of the marsh there, the freshwater marsh.

And, this is where the Shannon Brook pours into Frenchman's Creek and most people here are familiar with Frenchman's Creek. It's the site where old historic French privateer was lost and it was so named. And the Frenchman's Creek, we're seeing the mouth of it running out into the flats at low tide in Musquash Harbour in this area…

7:49 P.M.

((END OF TAPE 1/SIDE 1))

…..few years, so we're near the mouth of Frenchman's Creek and we're looking right out into the Marine Protected Area of the Musquash Estuary. So, that land we're seeing in the background is Musquash Island. And at this point here we're about ¾ km above Black Beach in Musquash Harbour. And then again, we're just looking out at Musquash Harbour at the other side of the lighthouse towards the plant. So this is the Marine Protected Area and that is where the dump site is going to be located adjacent to that freshwater wetland. In fact they're going to take a small portion of a hectare of the wetland for the dump, so it says in the environmental report.

Anyhow, I guess people have some kind of understanding as to why we don't want it there and why we feel it's going to threaten the Marine Protected Area. Thank you Marie.

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

We're also concerned about the stack emissions both on the natural environment and the communities adjacent to Musquash Estuary. We see a need for the establishment of additional air monitors and monitoring programs to protect human health and ensure enhanced environmental standards for the Marine Protected Area are met. We wonder just what health risks are happening at the moment when the waste from that stack is dumped or deposited on local vegetable gardens. In that area we see definite evidence of particulate and whatever coming down onto the ground.

Now at the moment we'd like to show you the video of this Marine Protected Area. David….

DAVID THOMPSON

Yes, we're going to see a video, which the Conservation Council had commissioned about a year ago on the Musquash Marine Protected Area. This area…all the studies have been done on the Marine Protected Area now, there's no more research or studies to be done. You know, it's in the process now of going ahead in the final stages of hopefully being proclaimed by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans very soon. So any indication that it's just under some primarily study that might be given to you by anyone else is not true. And most of the research that's been done in the area has been done by non-governmental organizations, such as ourselves the Conservation Council, and underwater mapping has been done as a joint effort by the Fisheries and Oceans Department and the University of New Brunswick, as well the Fisheries and Oceans Department has done benthic work in the area. But it's prepared to go ahead and it's very close to the Coleson Cove plant, so you're going to see it in a moment here. Let her go...

I'd like to mention that Marine Protected Areas in Canada, so if we could get this one moving, we're going to have the first one in Canada right here.

((VIDEO & AUDIO BEGINS))

"On the New Brunswick coast of the Bay of Fundy, just west of Saint John, there's an estuary called Musquash. It is a zone where fresh and salt water meet and mix to create a self enriching system. As ecosystems, estuaries are comparable to rainforests and corral reefs in biological production.

In 1998, the Conservation Council of New Brunswick under its Marine Conservation Program released a Report on the State of Estuaries in the Bay of Fundy. The report found that every significant estuary except one has been impacted by major industrial, resource or residential development. Only the Musquash Estuary remains relatively undeveloped, still functioning ecologically much as it always has. The Conservation Council with the support of the Fundy North Fishermen's Association and local communities' organizations nominated the Musquash Estuary as a Marine Protected Area under the Canada Ocean's Act. This designation protects the area from harmful future development.

The Musquash covers 27 km^2 from the mouth of Musquash Harbour reaching inland to the head of tide on the east and west branches of the Musquash River. The outer boundary of the protected area follows a line from Gooseberry Island on the western edge across the mouth of the harbour to Musquash Head on the eastern edge. The high tide limit marks the landward boundary. Supporting a valuable lobster fishery, these waters are populated by many fish species. A keen eye can often catch a glimpse of Harbour Porpoise and seals feeding on herring and flounder.

The rocking shoreline of Musquash Harbour is the first of three dominant habitats within the estuary. The islands provide nesting areas for several species of seagulls, cormorants and ducks. The intertidal zone is largely covered in thick beds of rockweed where Common Otters like to feed. Irish moss and kelp beds are found in the subtidal zone. These seaweeds help fuel the biological productivity of the estuary and surrounding coastal waters. These waters are home to many creatures including crabs, starfish and mussels. The estuary is a nursing and feeding area for several saltwater fish and those that migrate to freshwater streams to spawn.

Travelling through Musquash Harbour away from the open bay, the rocky shoreline gives way to large tidal mudflats; an often under appreciated habitat. Home to abundant Sea Worms and Mud Shrimp, these flats provide a feast for shorebirds that fuel up here on their annual migrations. Great Blue Herons feed on small fish at the edge of the tide. The flats also provide the right conditions for Soft Shelled Clams, allowing for a small commercial harvest.

Moving inland beyond the mudflats, the estuary transforms into extensive salt marshes cut through by several tidal creeks. This third primary habitat is dominated by Cord Grass and Marsh Hay, a source of nutrients to the estuary and the bay beyond. Musquash contains the largest intact salt marsh remaining on the New Brunswick side of the Bay of Fundy.

Plant species in the estuary are typical of Fundy coastal and marsh zones. Seaside Plantain, often called Goose Tongue, is common. Its leaves can be cooked and eaten. Glass Wart, also known as Sand Fire, is another edible plant. The purple blue flower of Sea Lavender, or Sea Heather, blooms on the marshes in mid summer. Beach Pea and Oyster Plants flourish just above the tidal limit on sand and gravel beaches. Colourful Likens are common.

Canada Geese and various species of duck use the marshes as breeding and feeding grounds and as a stopover point in their yearly migrations. Where the forest meets salt marsh; Bald Eagles, ospreys and owls and several species of hawks nest and prey on fish and small rodents. Deer frequently come to graze on the marsh often gathering in large numbers.

Estuaries are a key link in the marine environment supporting a rich diversity of life. Healthy estuaries are essential to a healthy marine ecosystem. They contribute to a complex web of life from the smallest invertebrates to the largest mammals.

The Musquash Estuary contributes to the economy of nearby fishing communities and provides new opportunities for eco-tourism. The Musquash Estuary is a sanctuary of natural beauty and integrity along a coastline that has suffered greatly from industrialization, resource extraction and development. As a Marine Protected Area and through the ongoing stewardship of local residents and organizations, the Musquash will remain an ecological reference point for generations to come." (Clapping)

HELEN-MARIE TREMBLAY

I'll go on with this because there's no sound. In summary, we make the following three recommendations. Recommendation #1 – That the boundaries of the Environmental Impact Assessment Study be extended to include the Musquash Estuary and Watershed and that the significance of the Musquash Estuary and the Marine Protected Area Program be fully documented and acknowledged in an additional section to be added to the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.

Recommendation #2 – That no new or additional development be permitted to occur in the Shannon wetland area

Recommendation #3 – That a system of air monitors be placed around the Musquash Estuary and in the communities of Lorneville, Musquash and South Musquash, and that a comprehensive monitoring program for atmospheric depositions be established. The monitoring program and placement of monitoring equipment must be developed in consultation with the local communities and the Marine Protected Area Management Committee. And, we recommend that this be done immediately as present pollutes are a concern to us.

That is all of my presentation. I do have a couple of questions, they're just short. How (clapping) How much of the $750 million for this Project has already been spent? If any?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

That's NB Power's staff question.

GAETAN THOMAS

Approximately $30 million.

HELEN-MARIE TREMBLAY

$30 million…O.K. Have you factored in a desalination plant? You're going to ask me why. I'm going to tell you that after I was at the Thursday meeting, you used figures for the

Musquash Watershed that at present do not exist. And, if you're going to go forward over our dead bodies so to speak, with the Orimulsion®, you are going to have to take salt water out of that bay and turn it into freshwater to get water because there's barely enough up there now to run what it is doing. The bulletin I received at the meeting says that NB Power wants to produce clean and effective power for New Brunswickers. I would ask is this Brunswick, Maine; Brunswick, Massachusetts or New Brunswick, New Jersey? (Clapping)

I'm sorry that I didn't catch his name at the Thursday meeting, but there is a doctor here that is a consultant from M.I.T. In his remarks to us he stated, that he got a lot of his information from government departments. I want you to listen closely, because I have a message for him. Government departments don't lie, they just don't tell the truth. (Clapping) You have to think on that one.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Ms. Tremblay. It's now practically 8 O'clock and as I mentioned earlier in my introductory remarks, I said at 8 O'clock we would ask for general questions and responses prior to taking a break and after the break we would continue with the registered presenters. So at this time, I would ask if there are general questions and responses from the audience.

DAVID THOMPSON

....not Germaine, I spoke to a ...where's the lady I spoke to?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Mrs. Daigle, yes.

DAVID THOMPSON

Yes, I spoke to her before the meeting and I had asked if we could clear the videos before the meeting broke for break. Now, I have a video that was taken by the Conservation Council at the Power Commissions' Dalhousie plant. Now do people want to see that and kind of reflect on it during the break? What do the people in the room want to do? (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I have no problems that we clear the videos. I thought they were done.

DAVID THOMPSON

O.K. Then we'll show the video. I'll say a few words about it. I believe the gentleman in the back could start the video now. Fine.....

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Mrs. Wayne, we're going to do the video first if that's O.K.

ELSIE WAYNE

Then we can ask questions after?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Yes, please, yes...

((VIDEO BEGINS – 166 – Tape 2/Side 2))

"On the north shore of New Brunswick where the mouth of the Restigouche River meets the Bay of Chaleur, the Town of Dalhousie and the people of the surrounding area having been living with the impacts of Orimulsion®. The New Brunswick Power Commissions' Dalhousie Electrical Generating Station has been burning Orimulsion® since 1994."

DAVID THOMPSON

Let me tell you that this plant is 1/3 of the size of the Coleson Cove plant so the potential pollution at Coleson Cove is three times as great if the equipment works in the same way that this does. Anyways, we went up and interviewed people there, very articulate people in the community who you will see in a moment. We only had one day to do our work there and I've since talked to some of the people that we've interviewed and they say that pollution has been the worse in the past week than it ever been since the plant's been operating. So anyway, I believe that Mr. Gaetan Thomas talked to one of the people that I talked with too in the past week and I think he told him the same thing. Thank you…let the video continue…

((VIDEO:))

"….spoke with local residents about their experiences living with the fallout from this type of fuel. "

((VOICE #1))

"The whole question about Orimulsion® coming in was a surprise to me. I didn't know anything about it. There was to my knowledge no environmental consultation. The first thing I heard was that Dalhousie had been chosen. I guess this was supposed to be some kind of gift or reward for whatever to be the first to try this new wonder fuel. The very first thing that people were concerned about was when the plant started up was a huge backfire, which completely coated sections of the town with a black soot. And, which caused NB Power considerable embarrassment and a week or more of extremely heavy duty labour and several hundred thousand dollars in clean up procedures. It was a real mess. And I'm afraid that the burning of Orimulsion® started in the minds of a lot of people with a rather negative bang.

I run a kayak program for the Town of Dalhousie in the summer. And, one of the joys is to be able to take small groups of people from the Inch Arran Park , which is right at the eastern end of Dalhousie out around the Bon Ami Rocks where there is a bird colony and down through the Eel River Cove, Eel Cove its called properly, then onto Eel River Bar and towards Charlo. It's an almost glorious stretch of water to work on, except when this plume is painting 50-60% of the sky a rather interesting shade of brown and purple."

((VOICE #2))

"Certain weather conditions I become very concerned about the plume that is exiting the stack. This plume can be as we see today appears to be fairly white and normal, but in other times under certain weather patterns it can be extremely scary to see. There are those times that it is significant enough that I just wish I could go down and turn it off."

((VOICE #1))

"Several times a year the smoke…the plume from the thermal plant will come directly at us and we're actually living in the plume and I can tell you that it is quite irritating to the lungs. And, just the ….the whole visual effect of that…it's not good for the tourist industry…this is a beautiful area and its definitely marred by the smoke when it hangs around…this perk less brown haze.

They have tried very hard to correct the situation. They've made modifications a couple of times to the plant and spent quite a bit of money to try and fix it up. But, I would say they were unsuccessful."

((VOICE #3))

"I never had a problem with allergies and I worked in the paper mill here with all different chemicals and dust and everything else and never had a problem…but, at 38 after my allergies kicked in…after a few years of them burning Orimulsion® here. It was through a contact in Florida that I found out that the heavy medals within the Orimulsion® is directly linked to asthma, breathing problems, allergies…the doctor finally put me off on disability full time because I was missing too much time at work. It was environmental illness and there was no two ways about it. It was a trigger. I never had these problems before and all of sudden my allergies were triggered and it's not just a seasonal thing; it's all four seasons. The headaches are daily. Every once in a while I have to go down for an injection because the allergies are so intense."

((VOICE #2))

"I'm 52 years of age now and I noticed in the last several years that I have lost a sense of smell. Just what I could attribute that to, I'm not exactly positive, but I've had an increase of the sinusitis."

((VOICE #3))

"The pollution and the control devices, like the electrostatic precipitators only work to a certain degree. They do well to maintain and contain the heavy particles that are in 1.0 and above, but there's over 50% of the particulate matter that comes out of there that is .02; that really escapes the precipitators. So, it's right out of the stack and into the community. So, they haven't been satisfactory….they haven't done their job."

((VOICE # 1))

"We are in bad need of epidemiologic studies to take a look at the footprint where the stack, where the plume comes down to find out about the presence of extremely fine micro particles of certain heavy metals. They are there; we know this from the burning of Orimulsion®. They are there in such fine sizes that they are readily breathed into the lungs and into the deepest recesses of the lungs. Then are we, question mark, looking at a series outburst of certain respiratory diseases including lung cancer in 20 to 30 years."

((VOICE #3))

"I had my blood tested years ago because it was a concern. And when the test results came back I had vanadium, cadmium, nickel…the other heavy metals that are associated with Orimulsion® that come out from the stack…I imagine the concentration might be higher now. But if every person within a 50 mile radius went and had their blood tested, they would find these heavy metals within their system. So, it's all the way down to Bathurst and all the way to Kedgwick.

((VOICE #2))

"I don't believe our elected representatives have truly stood up to protecting the health of our community from this Orimulsion® plant here. I believe there really are serious health consequences."

((VOICE #1))

"We live in a funny world I find in that if there is suspected that there is a problem with a certain process than the onus seems to be private citizens to come up with this and to provide all the answers and the only responsibility that government, that Department of the Environment and other agencies have including the utility itself is to promote and sell the stuff. And it seems to me that is backwards. That is the government and the Department of Environment particularly ought not to be simply shells for industry. The Department of Environment has a mandate and a responsibility to look after our concerns. I don't think that that happens."

DAVID THOMPSON

That's a strong message (clapping) …it's a very strong message and …

((VIDEO:))

((VOICE #3))

"…if they wreck another community right now, it's almost like murder…they know people will die. Our government knew from the studies that these metals were harmful and after a while if they are related to cancer, then after awhile some of us will die and the government knew that."

((VOICE #1))

"If I understand the demographics concerning Coleson Cove, that produces somewhere in the vicinity of three to four times as much power as does this plant in Dalhouise…if that is the case I can only imagine what the first reaction of people in Saint John and Lorneville, the other areas are going to be when that first purple plume lands in the middle of Saint John under certain atmospheric conditions.

I have a difficulty in imaging off loading Orimulsion® safely, continuous at Coleson Cove, where I understand they are going to be offloading just at some sort of off shore buoy. And, dealing with 40-45 foot tides, wide open to all sort of elements. If Orimulsion® gets loose, it does float on top of the water like crude does, it spreads throughout the whole water column. Somebody compared the introducing the Orimulsion® to the water as very much like mixing chocolate syrup into milk. It spreads throughout the whole and it's therefore, uncontainable because of the emulsifier, the surfactant that is used has been known to have serious gender bending implementations, it's an estrogen enhancer…what effect that would have on what's left of the Bay of Fundy salmon stocks including commercial stock…lobster fishery and so on. There was an application made by the Florida power commission to the Florida State Government a number of years ago and that was turned down. Obviously the Americans have some major concerns about the use of this supposedly safe, cheap, wonder fuel. I think if I were a citizen in Saint John, in Lorneville or any of those areas, I'd want to know why Coleson Cove should be converted to a product that the biggest energy user in the world is obviously not even considering using. Why is Dalhousie in northern New Brunswick the only community in North America that is using this stuff?"

((VOICE #1))

"I would like to see natural gas used as an alternative to dirty fuels like Orimulsion®. I would like to see some scale wind power generation set up also."

((VOICE #2))

"I would like to say to other communities to consider other forms of energy in supplying electricity."

((VOICE #1))

"People have indicted that they are prepared to pay for environmental solid ways of doing business and yet governments right across the country, federal and provincial, seem not to be taking this seriously. But, the polls have been there. The polls have suggested this for 10-15 years now." (Clapping)

DAVID THOMPSON

Before I go on and I'm not going to talk because the Chairman wants to break the meeting, but I want to say a couple of comments that won't take any longer than about a minute and a half. One thing is there is very little said about Dalhouise in this Environmental Impact Assessment. The same that very little is said about the Musquash Marine Protected Area or the Loch Alva Protected Area, one of the eight protected areas in the Protected Area Strategy that people in this province worked so very hard to get. This kind of work by consultants…and I can see they're taking notes now…there probably taking notes to explain away what we've…to minimize what we've said in the video and what's been presented and you'll see them doing that. They've been retained after they've done this report by Power Commission, which is paying their salaries to explain these things away. But I think the situation in Dalhouise is one that needs corrected before they start building another one. And I'll give the rest of the Conservation Council's presentation later in the evening. I understand the Chairman wants to let a few people ask a few questions who might want to leave early and then I'll continue on with the Conservation Council's presentation.

But, I think it's very important that all the information get on the table. And, if Environmental Impact Assessments continue to be carried out by the proponent and by people that proponent hires, by consultants he hires then we're going to see environmental assessments that approve every project that comes along no matter how bad it is. That's what we've seen for the last 25 years. But, I don't think it's what we want to see for the next 25 years. Is it? (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Mr. Thompson…now the floor will be open to people who come up to the mikes on a first come, first serve basis. I see someone at mike #2, I think I recognize this lady.

ELSIE WAYNE

Yes, I have a question and having watched the video, I'm sure that we're all impressed with that…but, my question is could you please tell me with natural gas that is going to be coming right through here and going through to the states…why we would even consider Orimulsion® versus natural gas. Is it dollars and cents? Is that what it's all about? Because, if you need more money at N B Electric Power in order to say yes it should be natural gas and not Orimulsion® then I think everybody in this room including myself and I have another colleague here at the Provincial level…we don't mind going after the government to get you the money that you need. Because I really think it's a very serious situation. It truly is when you look at what has happened to the young man there that was saying he has a problem with his lungs and so on. I think you don't want any of these people, not one of you would want anyone of these people here to be affected, their health wise…through changing it to Orimulsion®. So is it a dollar and cents thing? Is it basically just that? Why are we not going to go with the natural gas?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I believe that question should be answered by NB Power.

GAETAN THOMAS

When we evaluate a project like this there are number of considerations that come into play. The economic is one case, the business case. But, there are a number of other factors. You know there are environmental requirements and when we looked at the issues, there was also the timing of the Project with the respect to the availability of natural gas to meet the requirements. The bottom line is that we need to do something by 2005. We have to reduce the SO_2 emissions.

What the video didn't show is the number of pollutants that were reduced significantly and when you have a number of pollutants like we seen there, at the end of the day when you're left with the smaller ones, you still see the…it's an onion…you peel one piece then there's another piece and another piece…what we see at Dalhousie now is sulphur trioxide. It's a very small component, but it is visible. We agree at NB Power that it is not a good picture. And we are committed to resolving. What we done here when we looked at all the alternatives, the next alternative on the table is a blended oil solution, which is the lower sulphur oil and the 1% and 3% as I explained. To go… the alternative will reduce SO_2 by 2005, we will meet the 40,000 tonnes requirement for Coleson Cove, but it will not reduce the particulate or the fine particulate that the people are all concerned about. And I mean this is the issue, its 1000 megawatts of generation, we do have a solution and we believe it will solve the problem.

Now on the health issue which is very very critical, we need extensive studies, and I would like to for the benefit of the audience for Greg to comment on this, because AMEC did the study on the human health and I would like Greg to comment on that just briefly.

GREG GILLIS

Do you have another question?

ELSIE WAYNE

I'm going to listen first.

GREG GILLIS

Thank you. First of all the health investigation was conducted by Dr. Brian Magee, who is here tonight. And, the investigation first of all it started out on the premise that there were already low potential risks to people's health associated with this. Dr. Magee is a Toxicologist with a PhD from Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The conversion to Orimulsion® will reduce that already low health risk even further.

With respect to some of the comments in the video associated with Vanadium I guess was one of the elements that was mentioned. Vanadium has been identified and I've seen in it some of the information in the press, as particularly attributed to Orimulsion®. Vanadium is the 22nd most available mineral in the earth's crust. It's available in most fuels. It's available in the foods we eat; in shellfish, in grains, in tomatoes for example...so the sources of vanadium, there are many. Vanadium is also listed as a mineral nutrient by Health and Welfare Canada. So, our bodies need a certain amount of vanadium. We are reducing through this project (noise from participants)...we are reducing through this project; there are significant reductions in the emissions of all particulate, of all material into the air shed.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

This lady had a supplementary question?

ELSIE WAYNE

Yes, I do...you did answer Mr. Gaetan that is basically dollars and cents and timing...and timing...you have to change it by the year 2005. I'm not just sure when you're natural gas is going to be going by Lorneville, but I'm going to say this: The number one, I have to say to me, the number one priority here has to be the environment and the health and welfare of the people. Not just here, but in the whole of the Saint John area. And I say this because we will spend all the money that we should have been putting in natural gas probably, on health problems because of the situation. (Clapping) So, I know you're in a difficult position. We realize that, but we just want you to know that we have major concerns. My other question is I noted that you're going to need twice as much water from our water system as you used today. Did our City of Saint John in the Engineering Department take a look at this request, because sometimes you know if we don't have a lot of rain and it's a hot summer, and you know you don't have a lot of snow in the winter as well...our water system out here at Spruce Lake, it's not always as high as you'd like it to be and that is a very, very major concern that I have when you need twice as much for this system as used today. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

The question is in regards to the water supply?

GREG GILLIS

Yes, we did investigate the water supply for exactly that reason. And just some pieces of information. We looked at the historical use pattern of water from the Spruce Lake and Musquash Watersheds and found that peak assuage was actually a decade in the 70's or early 80's when there was a considerable amount more water being used from the watershed than there currently.

ELSIE WAYNE

Now you had a population of 90,000. Then you have a population of 59,000.

GREG GILLIS

That's correct and the major users at that time were the industrial users and they continue to be the major users. In the Environmental Impact Assessment you'll see the information, which indicates that even today, we're well, well below the numbers that we've used in the decade of the 70's and 80's, as I mentioned. We've had these discussions with representatives of the City and they see no concern with the availability of water in the Musquash and Spruce Lake Watersheds to supply this plant in addition to the current demands.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. Thank you…the gentleman at the microphone #5 I believe was the next person that was up and so if you'll identify yourself sir and have your say.

JIM WEBB

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jim Webb. I'm the leader of the Grey Party of New Brunswick. I'm not a professor or anything Orimulsion®. But, what I've heard the last hour here I'm very, very upset. And I think the Grey Party of New Brunswick will have an environmental thing in their policies that will be second to none. What I've heard so far, I don't like what you're doing. If it takes one life, why would you go to Orimulsion®? Why don't you go to natural gas? It's the cleanest fuel in the world. Go to natural gas and never mind this risk of lives in this province. I live in this area and as far as the Spruce Lake Watershed; I've lived in this place for 76 years…I've seen years we could wade across Spruce Lake…now you're going to use twice as much water. Where are you going to get the water? I'd like that answered. That Spruce Lake is very, very dry, very dry. And you say twice as much water…it's not feasible and it simply will not work. (clapping) Anybody want to respond to that at the head table?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

So sir, you want to address the issue of the water supply again?

GREG GILLIS

Sure, as I said earlier we investigated the water supply. One of the major concerns is exactly as you put it. Is there going to be enough fresh water? The answer to that question based on the investigations that were undertaken is a clear yes. If the Spruce Lake Watershed requires additional water, there's a system in place to pump that water from the Musquash Watershed, which is currently in place to…..(noise from the audience)….that's standard practise in periods of low water. It happened last winter. It happened in year's past and will continue to happen from what I understand from the City operators.

JIM WEBB

Supplemental question Mr. Chairman…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Yes, please…

JIM WEBB

I've lived here 76 years and I can not see in my lifetime or anybody's lifetime using twice as much freshwater…I don't care if you get Loch Alva and Musquash Watershed…your gonna run out of freshwater, but you'll have enough for this Orimulsion® place. We won't have enough to drink. (clapping) And, I'll close my statement Mr. Chairman…I have to run…why don't you people go home and go to natural gas. (clapping).

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much sir. I believe the next person that was up was at microphone #4 over here.

IVAN COURT

Councillor Ivan Court from the City of Saint John. I know all about water, I was on the Environment Committee for the City of Saint John for the last three years. You're correct there is a pumping mechanism. It costs us a $125,000 every time the water level at Spruce Lake goes down to an unacceptable level to replenish the water and so on. I'm really upset to find out that it's going to take twice as much water than was presently being used at Coleson Cove, so that cost is passed onto the citizens of this city. I'm just wondering in regaining that cost…I'm going to have to talk to City Staff to see if we are going to get that cost back for additional water supply that's needed down at Coleson Cove.

One of the other questions…the strategy for the City was eventually…we have a plant to water…we were going to bring the water in from the east…freshwater…and, eventually have a pipeline to come across and we were going to use the water at Spruce Lake for industrial use in East Saint John. We were just going to switch the water supply. That's the long term plan. But if you guys are consuming twice as much, I don't know where that plan is going to go.

The second thing I have to deal with, also deals with water…I'd like to know where in North America they would use a monobuoy to unload Orimulsion®? Is there anywhere else in North America that they do that? I'd like to know how you compared how safe it is to unload this on the offshore with tides of 40 feet and higher and so on. I am concerned with that because I did fish in the Harbour of Saint John for a number of years and I do understand that this material goes down eight feet in the water. Well, in low tide that's going to destroy a lot of the fishing in this general area and so on. So I would like to know what are the safety precautions that will be taken if it is unloaded? How many people are on site? Is a couple of people on site or is it every time a ship comes in? I would like to know the safety precautions for the unloading of that product.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I'm going to ask NB Power to respond to that.

GAETAN THOMAS

On the first question with the water, we won't deliberate too long on that...when we say twice the consumption, it is specific with Coleson Cove, which is only a small portion of all the users at the existing reservoir. So we're not doubling the requirement of the reservoir, we're only doubling the consumption at Coleson Cove. And the study is clear....

IVAN COURT

...tell me the numbers per day that you will be consuming...

GAETAN THOMAS

Today, we can get the numbers for you...O.K...our numbers are in cubic metres, it's about 3500 cubic metres per day...O.K...to double that 7000 cubic metres per day, which...so it is a small portion with respect to the whole customers in there. And that's why the impact will be small. We can discuss that in more detail. I would like to pass it to Charles to respond the second question, with respect to the measures on the monobuoy.

CHARLES HICKMAN

With regards to the monobouy, the monobouy that is in place today is design and has been operated for 30 years to operate safely where it is. The operator of that facility has their own interest in ensuring it maintains its safe and reliable operation in its location as it is today. We've entered into an arrangement where we'd like to use that facility. We would follow the procedures required by both that operator and by the federal authorities responsible and have a role in operating and regulating that facility. So that comes under things like the Canada Shipping Act, which has requirements for spill response, has requirements for any vessels coming in through the Bay of Fundy. Obviously, all of the vessels coming in will follow those regulations.

The other aspect that I'd just like to note is that in terms of the total amount of fuel coming in shipments...we're reducing the number of shipments of hydrocarbons coming into the Bay. We're halving the number of shipments. And the vessels we'll be using will be double hulled vessels, so explicitly we'll be reducing the risk associated with shipments of fuel coming into the Bay of Fundy.

IVAN COURT

You didn't answer the other question I had ....where else in North America is this method being utilized for the unloading of this material?

CHARLES HICKMAN

Sorry, you're correct. The fuel is loaded at a monobouy in Venezuela. There are no monobouy using or unloading Orimulsion® at the moment in North America. It is used like I say for unloading Orimulsion® off the coast of Venezuela in the Caribbean Sea.

IVAN COURT

Do you have people properly trained for the handling or unloading of this material? I mean it's a different material that's presently being unloaded. Have people been trained in case there's a spill in that general area?

CHARLES HICKMAN

At this moment people have not been trained, but that's because we're not bringing it in at the moment. Two points: the fuel Orimulsion®, it handles almost identically to fuel oil. We're very familiar with how to handle fuel oil. It basically looks the same and behaves the same in terms pumping and unloading from the vessel.

8:30 P.M.

((TAPE 2/SIDE 2 ENDS))

…so we are very familiar with what's required to unload fuel oil or Orimulsion®. We do it in Dalhousie as we do at the moment.

In terms of the training in spill response, which you mentioned specifically, today there's nobody trained at that facility for Orimulsion®. Before any shipments can come into Canadian waters, through the Bay of Fundy or unloaded, there is a requirement to have and we will work with the response agencies to ensure there is people trained, the equipment is in place to allow a response, the procedures are there, the training programs are in place and the exercises are done. So yes, before any vessels come in with Orimulsion® the entire spill response capability will be in place.

IVAN COURT

Mr. Chairman is I could have just a follow up to that…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sorry, if I put the hang on for a minute…the representative of the Department of Environment and Local Government would like also to make a point.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Thank you…I just want to …I'm kind of going backwards now…but, I just wanted to talk about the freshwater supply. Obviously, it was a huge concern for the Department of Environment. It was a huge concern for the people that provided their comments for the draft guidelines. Not only did the City of Saint John look at it, now I'm suggesting that the planning group looked at it, the Environment Committee was privy to the information in the EIA review, as well as the Engineering Department I understand and others in the City of Saint John. As well, the Natural Resources actually manages the Musquash Watershed and they were interested in the Project, interested in the amount of water being taken, as well as not just from the management, but from a wetlands, from a fish habitat perspective. You know would the reduction in…would the drop in water affect natural resources. People in our department from Environment and Local Government were very concerned initially that this was going to affect water quality and water quantity. And in fact, all those people were satisfied with the review that was undertaken. Environment Canada asked questions about…what about global warming? How is that is that going to impact the situation? And an assessment was done of that and the Review Committee was in fact satisfied with the water supply study that was undertaken.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sorry, you had a supplementary question?

IVAN COURT

The other question when this material is being unloaded does it affect any other shipping in any way? Do ships have to wait in and out of the Harbour or out of the Bay when this is being unloaded? That seems to be a concern from some people.

CHARLES HICKMAN

There's a vessel management system in place in the Bay of Fundy today, which fishermen would be familiar with. The existing system will remain in place. There's a system of anchorages, which if the monobuoy is not available the Orimulsion® vessel would be anchored at the anchorages in accordance with the harbour requirements, the Port requirements. In terms of going to the monobuoy, that is basically a single vessel operation, so there would be only one vessel there. It would be scheduled in accordance with the operator of that facility and basically it would be managed with the vessel management system through the Port.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

In order to respect the rights of the registered presenters and so-on and the agenda we had set, I'm going to take one more speaker before the break and then after the break we'll resume with the registered presenters and then there will be another opportunity for people to make general comments and questions. So one more, I believe was at #3 microphone.

VERN GARNETT

Good evening Mr. Chairman. My name is Vern Garnett. I live out in Red Head and I'm here representing the Rural Environmental Defence League this evening. In regards to the water, the question was asked last week in terms of the gallons and the information was supposed to be brought here tonight. I see its not here tonight. My question is dealing with CO_2. Back in 1988 there was a climate gathering in Ottawa, in Toronto actually on climate and global change and it was realized at that time that CO_2 had to be reduced by 50% to make any difference. You bring yourselves forward to the Year 2000 right now and Canada is still 15% above that level. And they haven't reduced it, they've actually gone up 15% above the 1999 level. I'm just wondering why? This is scary. If we look back at studies our brains function preferably on water and oxygen and with the lack of water or the increased usage of the water…there's going to be a heavy drain on the Loch Lomond Watershed to provide freshwater for our population to drink. My question is that lack of water or the increased CO_2, what's going to happen to our children and our children's children? The question is why is there only a 3 to 6% reduction in CO_2 from the plant? And if everybody has the report, if they turn to page 33, the second paragraph down, just before it says effects of noise, it says the "report notes that decreasing emissions of any or all of these air contaminants may result"…may result, I'll state that again…"may result in health benefits." May result….it may rain next week, it may snow in July.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir, I'm not sure exactly what the question is? Is it the reduction in CO_2…is that what

VERN GARNETT

You are reducing a lot of things that are being pumped out right now O.K. But, there's been no plans made to reduce the CO_2.

GAETAN THOMAS

Well first Greg will…he has the numbers for the gallons…so Greg will answer the gallon first for the water and then I'll talk about the CO_2.

GREG GILLIS

The total current demand per day in millions of imperial gallons per day is 10,000 imperial gallons per day. That's the total that's being taken from the Spruce Lake Watershed.

With the future with the Coleson Cove refurbished plant in place that number will go up to 11 million imperial gallons per day. Now the historical usage has been up to 18 million imperial gallons per day.

VERN GARNETT

That information that was just provided…what that information taken from a study that was done in 1977 onward for 13 years?

GREG GILLIS

The historical use was taken from a historical study that was done, I believe it was published by Agars.

GAETAN THOMAS

Now about the CO_2 plan…we did acknowledge at the PUB Hearings that the Coleson Cove wasn't the main strategic plan for CO_2. We will have some improvement there by approximate 3% as a result of upgraded turbines, more efficient turbines. But we did discuss in the EIA, at the PUB Hearings and at recently revised at the PUB Hearings for Point Lepreau that we are looking for a number of options for CO_2. We have announced some wind turbine allotment for the Province, we are member of a company called GEMCO, who is looking at some of the credit options. You know how we can secure offsetting CO_2 mitigation and we're also considering possibly to reduce exports. So there is no mechanism in place today or no trading mechanism in place, but we are able to meet the Kyoto levels agreements when and if required.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much. I want to remind you that we're going to take a break now and after the break we'll return to the presentations from the registered presenters, namely would be the completion of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick's presentation, then following that will be Pat Donovan of the Lorneville Community Recreation Association, Frank Hogan of Public Interest Project and Marlene Ross, a concerned citizen.

DAVID THOMPSON

Mr Chairman, if Mr. Donovan would like…if he would rather start first afterwards…you know I'd be pleased if that happens so I may talk to Mr. Donovan about that…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Do that at the break and that will be alright. Thank you.

PAT DONOVAN

Please Mr. Chairman if he doesn't mind.

DAVID THOMPSON

…the important thing here when I said that Mr. Chairman is that the people, the public, that this and the other night is the only night that the public has the chance to say anything and so the time should not be monopolized by paid consultants trying to minimize people's fears and trying to tell everybody everything's alright. No, no…just like everyday…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir, we did say that we would try to let everybody have their say before the evening is over and we will do that, we will respect that.

DAVID THOMPSON

I'd like to make one more comment Mr. Chairman and then I know everybody wants to go for a break, but there's a lot of people in this room and their good people, everyday people, much like the people in New Brunswick. But, they don't understand the politics and mechanisms of meetings and the way that this meeting is being done, the Power Commission has no responsibility to protect people's health in New Brunswick. It has no responsibility, no legal responsibility to protect to the environment….

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir, you're going to have your opportunity to make your presentation afterwards…

DAVID THOMPSON

Yes, I'm…..(voice in the background – "We want to hear this now…") O.K. Well, what I'm saying is that they have no responsibility, these paid consultants or the Power Commission. No vested responsibility, legal responsibility to protect the people of New Brunswick's health or the environment of the Province. And, they will answer every question that you asked them no matter what it is to say that the Project is good, O.K. Don't worry, because we're going to make it right. And, that's the answer you're going to get. So, if time is wasted with their answers to people's questions…the people that need to answer these questions are the people from the Environment Department, not the administrative people that are at the table tonight. But the scientists and the people in the environment department and the politicians. Not a bunch of people who are using this meeting tonight and used the other one as a public relations mechanism for themselves to forward their project ahead. So if we depend on them to answer our questions, then we'll get answers but five years down the road the answers won't seem like the answers we got from them. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

….we are on break…

8:40 P.M.

((BREAK TIME))

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Let's resume the meeting. Thank you. I would like to remind you that this is a non-smoking venue. I would also like to remind you that the opportunity to speak is open to everyone, but you'll need to approach a microphone and identify yourself. At the present time we'll resume with the registered speakers, then after the registered speakers have all been through we'll reopen the floor for general comments and questions.

CHARLES HICKMAN

I'd just like to make one small safety announcement. The floor in front of our….

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

That was already done sir. Thank you. So, the next speaker, register speaker is Mr. Pat Donovan of the Lorneville Community Recreation Association. Mr. Donovan.

PAT DONOVAN

Good evening Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to talk to you and I should say welcome to Lorneville. This is only about a third of the community, but that's all we could pack in here. Thank you guys! I appreciate you being here! (Clapping)

I'm going to begin so that everybody understands, I'll make this very clear. We're absolutely opposed and will not accept this so called Orimulsion® option, because it's not an option. (Clapping) Like most of the opponents, we favour a combined cycle natural gas facility. We also want to see improved NOx emission controls at the existing plant along with cleaner higher grades of fuel and reduced exports. That will achieve the targets that we need do. That is the responsible thing to do. That is what we have to do. (Clapping)

Before I get into the process of Orimulsion® specifically, there is one piece here, one part of the EIA I want to discuss. It's the road issue, the traffic study and my understanding is and a lot of people don't realize that that car traffic is something to the tune of 1679 additional vehicles everyday back and forth to work for the construction personnel. It might be interesting to know that this community went before Saint John Common Council and we expressed a concern that we had. We told them that there was only one access out of our community now and that's along our King William Road through the Spruce Lake Industrial Park. And should there be a fire or a leak at the industrial plant, we'd be cut off. Much of council's credit they immediately approved funding to put a gate at the end of Birch Hill Road, so we'd have an emergency evacuation route. Unfortunately, the New Brunswick of Transportation denied the request. We still only have one way out and bringing in 1600 cars is not going to work. I would suggest that nobody builds anything down here until we have a second, and preferably a permanent second access road from our community. (Clapping)

I've been involved in a number of other public hearings over different issues and this one is the most troubling by far for two reasons. Number one – is the impact on our region. Not just

Lorneville, not just Saint John, the Fundy region; but also I'm little insulted by some of things I've been seeing. Mr. Thomas I tried to set you up and you didn't fall for it. I asked him to put up the picture if possible of the plant and the artist's conception of it. It's not possible. But, if anybody has ever had a chance to look at it, it shows about 25 or 30 lush green grass all around it and that we know is not going to be there. It's not a golf course, it's supposed to be a power plant. But if you look at the picture, you'll also note there's no power lines and no transmission towers and that's just the beginning of so much that I see through here…all things are left out and I want to discuss that in detail and I will very shortly.

I don't want to hear about white, fluffy, billowy cloud-like substances. I don't want to hear about how it sinks. It doesn't float…out of sight out of mind, that is just not acceptable. O.K. We're not stupid people. When the oil goes down, there are things underneath that water. You can't just turn around and say that you're not even going to see and it's not going to hurt the seabirds. What about all the fisheries we have? And, the whales and the porpoises and everything else? Out of sight, out of mind, just doesn't work anymore.

I kind of wonder if there in some kind of time warp. It's a 1960's kind of presentation. We know that white clouds can be as bad as brown, or purple or blue or anything else. And I just wish you would give us a little more credit along the way. (Clapping) Thank you. By the 1980's people were environmentally aware enough to know that you don't mask pollution, you find real, honest solutions to it. And, that's what we need to do.

Now I'm going to do a little bit of interpreting. Councillor Court asked a question about how many monobuoys are used at different power plants around North America for offloading Orimulsion®. Councillor Court there is only one power plant in anywhere in North America that even burns Orimulsion®. Nobody else would dare to. It is not used anywhere's in North America. I don't think it's even used in South America. The Venezuelan's don't even use this stuff. We're it guys. Only Dalhousie and its not going to be Coleson Cove. (Clapping)

When this came up, I spend about two hours on the internet and Mr. Chairman if you'd allow me; we're going to present some written information to you. We've given copies to yourself, the Environment Department and the proponents. This is the first one…this Mrs. LeBlanc…our first Vice-President here. This one here I'm not going to go into detail on it. But this is from the British Parliament, because they tried to put Orimulsion® there back in the

19...well it's been there several times...we're going to talk about that. There were two power plants back in 1991 and 1992 that burned Orimulsion® in Britain. They're both closed now. There was another major project and that's what this refers do...O.K...in Wales and it was a huge project that never opened. There's a lot of those going around...O.K. The two plants I'll talk about in a moment...bare with me folks...we might have given these three Joe...O.K.? The next three in a room

(Female voice in background)

PAT DONOVAN

Did yah?. O.K. Here we are guys...the next one is from Environmental Digest. You notice the title Orimulsion® linked to asthma. If you'll be kind enough to flip the page, I think this is important. People need to hear this. "Opponents to plans to convert a Welsh power station"...that's the one that never got off the ground..."to burn Orimulsion® have produced survey evidence to back an allegation that the number of children suffering from asthma would increase. Orimulsion® a mixture of bitumen and water, patented in Venezuela has been labelled the world's dirtiest fuel by some environmental because of its high sulphur content. It is currently used by two British power stations in Richborough in Kent and Ince in Cheshire." However, they are now closed. O.K. "Doctors have reported unusual number of children with breathing difficulties in the Richborough area and a survey by asthma specialists, Dr. Rick Van Steenis who indicated a rise in inhaler use at local schools from 3 to 13% since the fuel has been burned.". Anybody who is interested, Dr. Van Steenis is going to be on CBC tomorrow morning here in Saint John. O.K. They're going to be interviewing him. That's the kind of results you get with it.

The next one I have from "The Friends of the Earth" here...all this can be verified by the way....it refers to the decision to stop the tests at Richborough and Ince and "marks the end of a troubled ridden and polluting experiment with Orimulsion®". That's just a quote from it. But there are some notes here and I just want to read them. It says: Power Jam Press Release on the 25th of September 1996 – "Ince Power Station to Close Unit Brought Back From Reserve at Fiddlers Ferry." They shut down the Orimulsion® plant there. It talks about other setbacks for

Orimulsion®. Richborough Power Station, which burned Orimulsion® from 1990 stopped generation in March" ....this would be in 1996..."Recently has been subject to a legal battle surrounding the impacts of burning this dirty fuel on the local environment." The local farmer whose crops were poisoned got an out of court settlement, so I can't find out how much that was...but this gives you an idea. O.K.?

A similar proposal similar to the one by National Power was rejected in Florida in the United States, because of environmental concerns. O.K. The Government and Cabinet rejected it twice. Florida Power and Light tried to go to court to overturn it, didn't happen. (clapping) In July National Power plans to import and burn Orimulsion® in Pembrokeshire were delayed by the intervention by the Welsh Secretariat to prevent planning permission being granted for construction of a jetty to import Orimulsion® at Milford Haven. So, that project died on the drawing board too.

The last thing I want to read, it's interesting, it says "A recent public opinion survey conducted by Roberts and Bell Associates Limited, revealed that 3 & 4 Pembrokeshire residents or 75% think there should be a public inquiry into the proposal to import and burn Orimulsion® at Pembrokeshire Power Station including 82% of those living close to the power station. There's some pretty stunning similarities there. Every plant in Britain is now closed. Actually if you go on the web sometime and look up Orimulsion® in one of these search engines, you'll find all kinds of huge announcements from Bitor...that's the people that make this stuff...about...that there's going to be some many hundred thousands and millions of tonnes to this place and the other place, but when you look at it there's only 20 power plants in the entire world that use it. Everybody else chickened out and we better start doing it too. (Clapping)

The state of California has rolling brown outs. We hear about the energy crisis in the United States. We know their building national gas plants. Why aren't they going with Orimulsion® ? Hey, guys is cheap, it's safe right? Does it might sense? Yeh, they won't...I asked NB Power, the representatives were here two weeks ago and met with us...why they didn't and they gave an explanation. They told us that there were no oil fired plants right along the coast. And, to be feasible it has to be along the coast. And, I'm not surprised by that...they suggested...they had a map they could send me. To their credit I got it within two days, but I read it. I counted 24 oil fired plants on the U.S. east coast that were on or very close to the coast, including 11 in the New York City area and none of them are using it. I wonder why? They're going to build a natural gas pipeline all the way from Goldsboro, Nova Scotia under the sea, why spend that money if you can have Orimulsion® ? The real reason is that American environmental lawsuits can be really brutal. O.K. (Clapping)

Now. O.K. This is where it gets good. Ladies and Gentlemen, Orimulsion® comes from a single source. I think everyone agrees on that. Everybody knows you can only get it in Venezuela. It's a country that has a turbulent history. It currently has political instability. When I was a little boy, my parents taught me never put all my eggs in one basket. Didn't you geyt the memo from Mom. Come on guys, think about it. Why would you take a chance from one source? What if the new regime comes in and it will not honour this agreement? What if there's a trade war like we had with Brazil over the aircraft subsidies? What if U.S. and Venezuela don't have a very good relations? What if we're asked to join in an embargo in future years? Your oil supply is going to be cut off. And what's going to happen the $750 million for the conversion is just going to have to go on top of that your already staggering debt and we can't afford it. (Clapping) That's not prudent investment. That's high stakes gambling with the public purse and it's unacceptable.

Now, while we're at it. I understand from the Public Utilities Board Hearings that the utility has entered into an agreement with Bitor, the Venezuelan company. But, it's a secret deal and you're not allowed to tell the public how much you're paying for this. You will not tell the media and you will not tell the Public Utilities Board, a government regulator how much you're paying for it. NB Power is publicly owned utility. In effect the shareholders are the people of New Brunswick who pay our taxes and I think you have no right to hold that information back from the Government, the Government regulators or the people. That is just wrong. (Clapping)

((David Thompson's voice in the background))...oh, really there's a copy of the agreement. This is it. They blacked it out. (Laughter & clapping from the audience) It's none of our business. I don't think so. I'm just getting started...

Last week the Conservation Council at the public hearing at the Coastal Inn said that New Brunswick Power misstated the greenhouse gas levels of 1990. Now Mr. Coon is not here and I won't give an exact figure, but I do know that NB Power is endeavouring to try and get their greenhouse gas or CO_2 levels done to the 1990 level of 17.3 million tonnes. And I believe

Mr. Coon said the real number from Environment Canada is 6 million. What chance are we going to catch that? But, I may be wrong on the figures, but that's really off when you consider they shouldn't do that. I decided that I would try and go through this Environmental Impact Assessment, this huge book and see what I could find...but, I have a problem you see...I don't understand a lot of this stuff. So, I took the one small section that I could find and it's on the shipping aspects of it, which Councillor Court asked about earlier.

Just to put this in reference Mr. Chairman, I'm a Ships' Master by profession. O.K. I'm a Deck Officer on ships. I have served in charge of oil transfer operations. O.K. So, I know what I'm talking about here. And, unfortunately I have to agree with NB Power that oil transfer operations are safe. This is not the 50's or 60's. There are a tremendous number of safeguards. People are responsible O.K. And, I'm not going to use scare tactics, because they don't exist. I've been out to Canaport where they're planning to offload this, and there systems are very impressive. Irving Oil deserves a lot of credit. I've got no problem with that at all. The only argument I could originally find was with the business of the double-hulled tankers, and I agree that yes, they're better in many circumstances...but, you used U.S. ports for comparison I guess...O.K., which is fine...except most ports in the United States have beaches, mud banks and that sort of thing. We have 100 foot cliffs here. O.K. We have some of the most turbulent water you're ever going to see...the highest tides...the strongest currents going. If this is...there would never be a grounding I don't think in the Bay of Fundy unless you happen to hit Splains Beach (sp?) just by luck. If you hit anything else it would be a catastrophe. Having said that I don't want to mislead people, as I said earlier there are lots of safeguards. The chances of a true catastrophic event are quite slim. I guess I really kind of helped your argument, until....I still have a problem believing....wait before I get into that. I do want to find out something else though. You do show a lot comparisons between the double-hulled tankers which are an average age of 7.5 years as opposed to the single-hulled ones now that are almost 25 years. I would remind NB Power that you are the people who have been chartering those ships and hiring those ships for years. If you really care about the environment, why have you been hiring junk tonnage all these years and putting us at risk? (Clapping)

O.K....fasten your seatbelts...now, like I said there wasn't much else I could find eh? Wrong! I found some numbers that I don't like and we're going to discuss those right now. This is from your own report...I skipped over some...go to the second page please, page 737 about oil tankers O.K. It says in here "that spills larger than 1000 barrels were selected for analysis. Spills in this size category tend to be reported more accurately and with greater detail allowing for a more complete analysis." You choose to use the U.S. figures, which is very good, because the United States has the strictest guidelines anyway on the face of this earth regarding oil spills. I can tell you and I can tell you from experience that the penalties for not reporting a oil spill are massive...very stiff against the owners of the ship, the ship itself, the Master and the licensed Officers. There's no where in the world that oil spills get reported more correctly and faster than the United States. That is a fact. So, what it doesn't say in here of course....most spills these days with all the redundancies I talked about are actually quite small...the stuff comes out very fast. It may only be a minute or two minutes...maybe it's only 300 or 500 barrels...right? And, what you have done here by only picking spills over 1000 barrels is to eliminate over 82% of all the oil spills reported in the United States in 1990. Sure makes your numbers look better doesn't it? We aren't done...(Clapping)

It says on here that that Corbett & Holt analysis for Lloyds voyage records for 1976 through 1990. I went on the internet...I want people to try this if you have the net. I went on using the Googgle Search Engine and in less than one minute I had this....these are the figures from the United States Coast Guard National Response Centre, Oil Database...current figures for 1991 to 2001...not 25 year old data...some of it's 7 months old and I got it in one minute. And it shows that the total number of spills by vessels in 1991 was 2914 and in 2001 is 4378. The number of reported spills has gone up over 50% in the last 10 years. We're a long way past errors and omissions now O.K.

Somehow the greenhouse gases...I don't understand it, you have an environmental department, how you couldn't quite get that...I don't know how you couldn't understand that the Musquash Marine Protected Area, which is only 3 kms from your site and somehow you overlooked that. A lot of these numbers don't add up, but I'll tell you this you can not do data on all the spills over 1000 barrels unless you had to look at the ones under a 1000 barrels. This isn't an error. This is not an omission and can you explain this Mr. Thomas? I'd really like to hear why and how you could possibly do this, because you can't. Want to try...this ought to be good...(Clapping)

CHARLES HICKMAN

Yes, I'll try…

PAT DONOVAN

Good for you…

CHARLES HICKMAN

A couple of things…the reason we have looked at the larger spills is because most people's questions and issues are raised are with regard to large spills. So we looked at larger spills as the issue as being on the table. We understand and we recognize and know full well that small spills tend to be more frequent. They also tend to be somewhat better controlled with equipment and response capability closer to hand. Yes, we looked at large spills. In terms of the data that was used, Captain Holt who prepared that section of the Report is available and if you're interested you can ask Captain Holt.

((VOICE IN BACKGROUND – turn up the volume!))

CHARLES HICKMAN

Sorry…the data that was used from Captain Holt's report, Captain Holt is here tonight if you wish him to explain why he chose that data…I'd be happy to ask him to come forward. For those you didn't hear the first part of my response…we focused on the larger spills because that was a concern that was raised to us. If you look at the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment that was done, it also tended to focus on the larger spills. That was because of the concern that was raised about the overall effects in the Bay of Fundy as opposed to the smaller spills that we recognize do occur.

PAT DONOVAN

Sir, do you have any idea of what a spill of 3 or 5 or 600 barrels will do. I'm sorry I can not believe that it was done because people were only worried about larger spills. It eliminates 82% and I'm sorry but that is not an accident. And not getting the current figures is not an accident either, I'm convinced of that. Anybody else here believe it? (Clapping) One more...

CHARLES HICKMAN

Would you like Captain Holt to explain this...

PAT DONOVAN

Yes, I'd like to know why you used the old data, if Captain Holt would like to, he's welcome...

CHARLES HICKMAN

Could I ask Captain Holt to come to the microphone please.

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

My name is William Holt. I am a retired U.S. Coast Guard Captain. I headed up the Coast Guard's Marine Environmental Protection Program. I was responsible for the Pollution Prevention and Response Program in the United States for four years following the Exxon Valdez. The data that Mr. Donovan is referring to...

PAT DONOVAN

Captain Donovan Sir, please, because I'm a Captain too. ((Laughter & clapping from audience))

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

I'll be happy to answer to your question. The data that you referred to is absolutely available. However, the problem is not determining the number of spills, it's the number of spills per something...per gallon carried...per number of times that a vessel comes into port. The only data that was available to use was as specified in the Report as to the number of vessel calls made it North American Ports, which is not limited to the United States...we did not limit the oil spill date to the United States, it was North American data. I hope that clarifies it.

PAT DONOVAN

Nnnno, but O.K.

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

Please tell me what I need to clarify it for you, because I'd like to.

PAT DONOVAN

There were about 16,000 port calls in 1990…is that the figures that are right in here?

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

That's correct.

PAT DONOVAN

O.K.

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

That was on average over that period of time I believe.

PAT DONOVAN

See the problem is the numbers get a little confusing because you can make numbers say things, but sir if you are…and I respect the fact that you're a retired United States Coast Guard Captain and you were in charge of oil response, but how come you couldn't find their web site and get current data? Why can't you go with the data from 91 to 2001? It was available to me in less than one minute. Why wouldn't you use that?

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

Because that data is meaningless for the evaluation that we did…the evaluation…((Noise from the audience))

PAT DONOVAN

Ladies and Gentlemen, fluffing, white, cloud-like substances…thank you. ((Clapping))

WILLIAM HOLT (CAPTAIN BIFF HOLT)

The evaluation that we did…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Mr. Donovan, if you go on with your presentation…they're not…

PAT DONOVAN

If you don't mind Mr. Chairman…thank you. O.K.? I don't mean to get upset, but it's anyway…alright…I'm going to give you one last, I think it's one last piece of information here, no there's a couple of them and I'll get through this as quick as I can. I got things out of turn here a little bit.

This one is interesting you can find that with your information. This is from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, March 7 of 2000…so that everybody understands. Here's another thing that doesn't make sense, because all we've been hearing about this stuff is that it does sink and you know it's not going to affect the seabirds, but never mind everything else. But, for this particular one their website has an article on non-floating oils and it's called: "Orimulsion® Fate and Behaviour" and it's by Merck Fegcus (sp?) with Environment Canada. I just want to read the second paragraph of this. It says: "Orimulsion® has been a matter of concern because of its unique spill behaviour. Upon entering into the water column, the material disperses. In saltwater the surfactant rapidly destabilizes and a slick begins to form within minutes of the water entry. Depending on turbulent energy"…like you might get big tides, currents and things like that. "…the product will largely form surface slicks within 48 hours." So what I'd like to know is does it float or does it sink? Because these guys, the Environmental Protection Agency, and Environment Canada says it starts to come to the surface. And you keep saying don't worry about it goes down. What do try it?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Are you looking for an answer now? Are you looking for an answer to the…

PAT DONOVAN

If someone would like to, if they don't that's fine, but if somebody wants to respond…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

But are you asking a hypothetical question or asking a question that you want an answer for?

PAT DONOVAN

Thank you sir. I would like an answer if you would like please…

CHARLES HICKMAN

Orimulsion® when it's first spilled into the marine environment will disperse below the water column, I'm sorry below the water surface. After awhile some the Orimulsion® will break down and will resurface as bitumen as a slick traditional as you would expect from an oil spill.

PAT DONOVAN

O.K. Some up and some down…ultimately.

CHARLES HICKMAN

Correct.

PAT DONOVAN

O.K. The last thing, no it's not the last thing, but something else…I won't be too much longer. I do have data here from the Canadian Coast Guard, from their web site and this is current…2002. It talks about projects they have doing with regards to development of response strategies for Orimulsion®. Page two, near the bottom, I think I've highlighted this…it says: "Some research and development work has already been conducted in the field of Orimulsion® and heavy fuel oils. An International Orimulsion® Working Group was originally created to help direct the work on Orimulsion® . However, due to other more recent critical issues such as Y2K, the working group has been unable to continue managing R & D Orimulsion® projects in an effective and efficient manner. The goal of this project justification is to set out a multi-year project work plan for Orimulsion® and heavy fuel oil R & D and to restate in the International Orimulsion® Working Group and have it oversee projects to work planned on a yearly basis." When you flip through this it tells you exactly what they're going to do and if you gentlemen would go to the fourth page....it shows here, this is in regard to "various studies will be conducted to determine Orimulsion® physical and chemical characteristics", which are important for recovery...it says, "Orimulsion® behaves differently from floating oils, this study will allow responders to better understand Orimulsion® physical properties in the water." It then outlines a five year plan to determine the dynamics, etc. of Orimulsion® , which means if they do get started this year by 2007, if all goes well the Coast Guard will have a reasonable plan for picking up this Orimulsion®. But you want to start shipping it in August of 2004. And I was under the understanding that everything was in place and you knew exactly how to get this stuff and if it spilled there would be quick clean up and it had all gone through the test, yet Fisheries and Oceans Canada says they haven't gotten there yet. Now, I'm not going to ask for any more explanations. I just want to put this into the public record and I want people to know about it, because I'm going to try and finish up, O.K.

The last piece of paper here from the ones that I've given you...this is from the Public Utilities Board and maybe Mr. Thomas I will ask a quick question on this one. It's from the Public Utilities Board Hearings I believe, and there are some questions...this is regard to...I guess the question was put toward NB Power...could they reduce their CO_2 emissions by reducing export sales? Well, in here the section I've highlighted it says: "We also support the development of an extended trading mechanism for CO_2 reduction credits." Mr. Thomas, if I'm not right in my understanding of this, I seriously want you to correct me...If there are standards out there, it applies to all power plants and if you have lower emissions, you basically get a credit for not polluting so much and if it's over, you would have to buy the credit from somebody else? Kinda like a air miles kind of a thing? Am I got the right idea? Could you explain it to me perhaps that would be a better sir.

GAETAN THOMAS

Well, there are a lot of systems in place for different emissions. Unfortunately on the

CO_2, there's no system in place so we can't speculate on what it would be…because it is a much more difficult issue, CO_2 because as you know the pollution in big cities with the cars and there are a lot of factors contributing globally to CO_2. So, there's no system in place. There are some systems in place in the United States for NO_x trading emissions. And, they would not necessarily apply here because they are different at each state and it is a system…one system I know for instance, if you put better emission control at one plant, if will overcome the other small plants that are not as committed of as easy to reduce NO_x emissions. So you can trade off one plant versus another. So, it's very much too early…there are mechanisms in place or groups in place that are exploring that and we certainly will work with the Province of New Brunswick that when we can establish what the direction will be and where we're getting in that direction. So it's a little early to tell you what they would be for CO_2.

PAT DONOVAN

I didn't mean that sir, I just wanted to …if I understood it properly. So if you have a very environmentally responsible power plant and you're under your emissions levels than that credit could be sold as perhaps if I had one that could be over…it's a trading mechanism like that? Kind of?

GAETAN THOMAS

It's a simplistic way, but you know…

PAT DONOVAN

O.K. well we get the idea. Now it also says in here…regional one…they're talking about these…I'll read it back here…"We also support the development of an extended trading mechanism for CO_2," that's greenhouse gas, "reduction credits. A regional one is intended to be pursued by the New England Governors and Eastern Canadian Premiers, but we believe it should be extended all across North America or more." Why? I mean…you can answer this if you like…but why would you want such a big one? Do you have to buy a lot of credits? Alright, never mind, we'll go on. (Clapping) I don't think you're going to be under target is the point I'm trying to make…on the last sentence here it says: " such as system would promote the most economic methods of CO_2 reduction." Buying credits is not CO_2 reduction, it might get you keeping within legal guidelines, but buying pollution points someplace else is not really CO_2 reduction. Right?. (Clapping)

O.K. Got to wrap it here. I grew up in Saint John, as most people here did in the Saint John area and I can go back…I can clearly remember 30, O.K. 40 years ago…

9:33 P.M.

((TAPE 1/SIDE 3 ENDS))

…trying to put in emission controls and now to be going with entirely new environmental processes to make things better. We as citizens have tried to do our part too. We're now paying higher taxes for an environmentally responsible landfill operation, we take up our plastics, cardboard paper and that sort of thing. We compost. We use better cleaning products and that all that sort of thing then along come you guys with this plan you know…and it really upsets me, because it negates everything…the hard work by our private industry. By the way, you are a public utility, you should be the role model to private industry to show them how it's going to be done. (Clapping)

Saint John has changed. You can see it everywhere you look. You can see these big shining, white cruise ships coming in and putting millions of dollars into our economy. You see tourism is very much on the increase. You see new businesses coming to locate here because of the improved quality of our life. I'll tell you one thing, I'm not going back to the 60's guys. It's just not going to happen! (Clapping) The Bay of Fundy, to use the government's own words is one of the "marine wonders of the world", the ecological significance of it is fantastic. Now, I'm not suggesting that the first tanker is going to come in, there's going to be an accident, but we can't afford to take that risk. O.K. Because the Bay of Fundy is everything to our life. It is our history. It is our culture. It affects the weather, the forests…it's us. It really is, and we can't gamble. You wouldn't move or put a new nuclear plant in downtown Saint John, why not they maybe perfectly safe, depends on your point of view…but, you just don't put them somewhere the risk, even minimal could cause a catastrophe. But that's what's going to happen here. We need this Bay of Fundy. It affects our economy. Look at the jobs, I mean the fishery, everything. We just can't gamble it all. We just can't do it. It affects our moods too.

(Laughter) So, we can't risk it so that NB Power can bail themselves out of their already outrageous debt by providing cheap power to New England.

Now wait a second....did you catch that? Cheap power to New England? I bet 90% of the people in this room have no idea that under your plan that 62% of the power is going to be exported for sale to the United States. We get the pollution. They get the cheap power. Ugh ahhh...no (Clapping) O.K.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Mr. Donovan sir, you've had double the time you were allocated..

PAT DONOVAN

O.K., sir would you give me two minutes to complete. O.K. ?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Certainly. Certainly.

PAT DONOVAN

O.K. Here we go...listen up...we're going to put a stop to it right now and here's how we're going to do it O.K. This project has to go to the Provincial Cabinet in 3 or 4 or 5 weeks. The Premier and the Ministers have to decide yes or no. Now they are responsible individuals. You see the Premier on television all the time talking about natural gas right? I'm sure they're going to do the right and reasonable and responsible thing. But, let's not take any chances there's an election coming Ladies and Gentlemen...it's coming this fall or it's coming next spring. And, we have to send a message that this is totally unacceptable. I'm sure that the government will side with us this, but we're going to make absolutely sure of it too. So Mr. Chairman, what I'd like you to do is to go back and tell the Minister that we are absolutely in opposition to this. And if they dare to approve this come election day, they're going to be in opposition as well. O.K. We're not mad about road tolls and paying 75 cents to get to work. This is our future. Our children's future and our grandchildren's future. It's our economy, our environment and our way of life. This is not happening. This Project is not going ahead.

Anybody else agree with me? (Clapping and cheers from audience)

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Mr. Donovan. You asked me to inform the Minister…everything that is said this evening is a matter of public record and everything goes to the Minister verbatim and in summary. So the words will be there.

PAT DONOVAN

Does anybody have any questions that they want to respond to before I go? Didn't think so. Thank you. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

So thank you Mr. Donovan. The next registered speaker is David Thompson of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick, who will complete the presentation that he began earlier.

DAVID THOMPSON

O.K. Don't be afraid by the big box…there's not a lot of secrets there or I'm not going to take a lot of time. Perhaps the most important thing that needed to said this evening has just been said by Pat Donovan. O.K. (Clapping) But, here's something I want to add to that…what's said isn't important, what's done is. So each and everyone has to take it upon ourselves to do something about it. I mean we have to back the Lorneville Community Association here, we've got to individually contact our politicians. We've got to make sure this message gets through. There are many people trying to prevent it in getting through. The Power Commission doesn't want it to get through, they're paying consultants hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of dollars in fees…there's a whole bunch of people and consultants at the back of the room. We see people here from the USA, very high priced people. And they don't want our message to get through. So we're the only ones that are going to take it through.

I would also like to make a pitch for the Marine Protected Area's campaign here tonight in the Musquash Estuary. I also want to make a pitch for ourselves, the Conservation Council and we do have membership forms back there. We're only able to do the bit of research and produce the kind of material with the support of people. We aren't able like them to tap your power bills and your taxes and work against the community. We have to work for the community and with the community and the only way we do it is with your support.

So anyways, the most important thing is to get a hold of these politicians and dig them out of the wall. Now I know that we have a very responsive MLA in this area, Milt Sherwood. I don't know if you're still here, but I saw him earlier in the evening.

(WOMAN'S VOICE IN BACKGROUND – no he left)

DAVID THOMPSON

Well he got Pat's message before he left so we don't have to worry. But, maybe we do. So maybe we better remind him to go write to government and tell his fellow members and former Cabinet colleagues that Orimulsion® is not coming to the New Brunswick coast. It's just not coming here. We have good alternatives in the Province. We have the possibility of natural gas, combined cycle generation with the waste of some of the heat from it and we have the possibility of starting some real advancements in New Brunswick with wind energy….real advancements. (Clapping) Anyway, I'd like to finish the Conservation Council's presentation. I don't want to take a lot of time at it because there's been a lot said tonight. Most things have been said that people need to know. But, people again…and I'll just say that people have all kinds of sentiment about the environment, sentiment about protecting their communities. People want to do this. But, unless you get off your butts and do something about it, it ain't going to happen. So what we want is the messages faxed, letters sent, petitions…We want to see letters in the newspapers and we want that message to go that it's not coming to Lorneville. Now I feel very proud and honoured to have worked with many people in this community a few years ago to stop the new dump, which they planned to put here…from coming here and to shut the old one down. And, we did it then. Also there was a proposal by some of these people right at the front of the room. In fact our consultant on the end was the consultant on the report on converting Coleson Cove to coal about 10 years ago, which they planned to do. It never went ahead, but at that time they wanted to rip up Black Beach. They wanted to dredge, where now we're proposing a Marine Protected Area in Musquash Harbour. And they wanted to put coal piles where the lighthouse are and take them over to the plant on conveyor belts. And, they we're trying to sell this and say how good it was and how it wasn't going to disrupt the Bay of Fundy, contaminate the air or do anything to the Musquash Estuary. So, they're singing a different tune tonight, but it's the same old song, and the same old people. (Clapping) To see our tax money and power bills pay for this, it's just not acceptable anymore...so, that's another message that has to go to the politicians. They're the real decision makers. We shouldn't be burdened at meetings like this with people that have no responsibility to people through legislation who can just say anything at these meetings then have something totally different happen. It's just not good enough.

Anyway, I want to get on with the presentation of the Conservation Council. There's a whole number of areas of concern. The Shannon Watershed has been pretty well touched on. We don't want any development in behind those oil tanks in that watershed. It's an elevated area. It's the hills that sit above Musquash Estuary. We've all seen in the video how the brooks run directly into Frenchman's Creek and out into the Marine Protected Area. And, everyone knows that landfills, no matter how their constructed, they eventually leak. Things happen. And, if there's other developments in that area, we don't want them either. We don't want parking lots. We don't want lay down areas. We don't want other industries there. That area that land around the Musquash Estuary has to be left in a natural state. I'm sure that Nature Conservancy of Canada or the community group here will only be too happy to take it over. In fact in talking with people...one lady...in the back of the room in particular and some others before the meeting started...they told me that their was a promise by the Power Commission much the same as these people are promising things tonight. About 25-30 years ago, this land, which was taken and expropriated wasn't used, it would go back to the community. So let's see that happen. What was that promise? (Clapping)

(WOMEN'S VOICE IN BACKGROUND)

....and he said at the time that if land that they hadn't used, hadn't been used within a reasonable length of time, it would be returned to the residents.

DAVID THOMPSON

So let's get it back and let's make it a park.

(SAME WOMEN'S VOICE IN BACKGROUND)

...they've had enough time...31 years.

DAVID THOMPSON

Let's make it a park. Let's get it back. Let's make it part of the largest protected area in New Brunswick. (Clapping) When we get the Musquash Estuary protected and with Loch Alva, we'll have a protected area bigger than any of the national parks in New Brunswick and more significant, right in our backyard and that will protect our communities, our water supplies and our way of life. And, we're not going to let these people destroy it. (Clapping)

Secondly there's a matter, which the Conservation Council has been trying get information about for months with very little or no assistance from the environment department, and that is on the Irving pipeline that currently runs from east Saint John to the Coleson Cove site and brings oil to site there. Now they don't intend...they're not planning on renewing that pipeline, it's been in the ground ever since the plant was built. It was put in there the way pipelines were put in back in the 1970's. We don't know....I have a copy of a report that was done again by consultants for the Power Commission. It says don't worry, everything's O.K., it's been tested....there might have to be a little bit of maintenance in the future, but it's going to be alright. We have no reason...no good reason to believe that. One part of the pipeline, which goes through the City of Saint John was followed by the natural gas pipeline when they brought it into Saint John. After they went by Saints Rest Marsh, they laid the pipe right close and parallel to that oil pipeline...the new gas line was laid in the same Right of Way, so they wouldn't have to acquire a new Right of Way for it. And, all along that pipeline...they found oil contaminated soil from leaks. I went into the environment office after getting permission from Fredericton. They wouldn't allow me to look at the files from the Saint John office, so I had to go the Deputy Minister, so finally after pleading and threatening to go the media and a whole bunch of other things. They said I could go in and look at the files, but not take them. There were 26 reports of oil contaminated soil along that line. There was a large pool just the other side of the Reversing Falls Bridge just on the eastern side on that bridge where it came a shore. The whole area along Chesley Street over a half of a kilometre from about Thornes to the Brunswicker was contaminated with oil. There was more contamination off of City Road, around the tracks that followed the railway tracks to the edge of Courtenay Bay at Haymarket Square. There was also contamination at Haymarket Square. And, there was lots more along Bayside Drive, of course out there it could of came from anywhere…any storage tanks or industry. We realize that, but other information I obtained…and, I made a call especially to the Environment Department to try and get it before this meeting tonight. I wanted to know how much soil was excavated when that natural gas pipeline was laid? How much contaminated oiled soil around that Irving pipeline to Coleson Cove? How much excavated from there and taken away for soil remediation? So, I talked to someone who worked on the project at the time and he told me he estimated there were 4 to 500 truck loads and not one word was said about it by the Environment Department when they were removing all this contaminated soil. It was not reported in the press or the media until this day. So, we don't know…we only know from what the consultants' reports are saying. And, I'm safe in saying that we're not convinced of the situation with the pipeline from Saint Rests Marsh to the plant. What condition it's in, because they didn't dig around it because the natural gas line didn't meet until it got closer to the City.

So, there's a very serious concern about groundwater in the area. The same concern from leachate as there would be from the dump, only it would be oil in this case that happened to leak into the ground and then perhaps flowed into somebody's well in the upper part of the community. So that's another matter of a lot of concern…that pipeline. And, I think that the community should demand that pipeline be replaced, whether the plant goes ahead or not. Even if it doesn't go ahead, that pipeline should be examined and replaced. (Clapping)

Secondly or thirdly, this document…this Environmental Impact Assessment, it compares the risk of spilling oil and Orimulsion® in the Bay of Fundy. But, what it should be comparing…it shouldn't be comparing replacing one dirty fuel with another…it should be comparing the risks between oil and natural gas and Orimulsion® and natural gas. (Clapping) The natural gas has no back end or front end environmental risks like Orimulsion®. With Orimulsion® we're going to have to bring it into the Bay in tankers. With natural gas, it's piped from Nova Scotia or wherever if there's another pipeline from across Canada…it will come in a pipe. There will be no tankers coming into the Bay with it. Then on the back end we wouldn't have to deal with traffic and shipping in the Bay....bringing in 500,000 tonnes of limestone a year to try and do something with the high sulphur content of the Orimulsion® and then trying to sell it or disposing it in a dump down near Coleson Cove in the future. So we eliminate both the front end and back end environmental effects with natural gas. And for these guys to have the gall to compare Orimulsion® rather than natural gas…I mean to make that kind of comparison with oil. It has no merit.

One thing… the other thing it says…perhaps the fourth thing it says…it says Orimulsion® will reduce the risk to the Bay of Fundy…well, that's pretty questionable. They say that they're going to have double-hulled tankers, but they could have double-hulled tankers bringing in the oil right now if they wanted to charter them. That's their option. It could be in the contracts, but it's not. So let's start with the next shipload of oil that comes into the Bay of Fundy for that plant. Let's ask to them bring it in a double-hulled tanker. How people want to see it come in a double-hulled tanker? (Clapping) Let's see your hands…So, there you've got your message. When you need another load of oil for that plant, you contract for it to come in a double-hulled tanker. But, to say that it reduces the risk…right now this oil for the plant is being unloaded in Courtenay Bay. And, I guess most of us are familiar with Courtenay Bay, when we think about it, it's not a very pleasant place. It's kind of oily around there and there's a lot of sewage going in there. But, if we look at Courtenay Bay very closely, we'll see it's sorta a backwater of Saint John…we don't find the whirlpools and currents that we find in Saint John Harbour. And it's fairly sheltered water and if there is a spill around there, there's lots of people around there to see it. So, if happens around there, people are going to take action pretty quick. Whereas at Canaport, any spill that has ever happened there has never been contained at Canaport. And there have been a number of them over the years.

One of the most recent ones I can remember happened in the winter several years ago. In fact it happened on the opening day of scallop season. And the first guy to find the spill was some guy from the Community of Lorneville who was out and dropped his scallop drags overboard and came up with big cakes of oil on his boat. These frozen lumps like butter and it didn't come on shore here, but it blew over to Nova Scotia. It come ashore on that shore above Digby, that's not too heavily populated and where there's not a lot of media around…so, there weren't a lot of media reports. But for the next six months afterwards they were employing local people to try and sweep up off the beaches and off the rocks what they could over there. Then it all came back on the Princess of Acadia and it came to Lorneville, where they burned that contaminated soil up there. Now how many people know about that? Now why weren't we told about that from the Department of Environment the same way about the way we weren't told about the contaminated soil along the pipeline? And, there's been lots of other leaks. And, there's never been one spill at Canaport that's been contained in the vicinity of the buoy. The winds, the tides have taken it wherever it would go. There was another one that went down to New River Beach when I worked for Department of Fisheries and Oceans. And, at that time there was still some herring weirs in the area there and there were several hundred tonnes of fish and herring weirs at that time...and people were never able to sell them. They just had to let them go, because the plants wouldn't take them because they were tainted by the oil.

So we have examples of it and we know it's not going to be contained out in the open Bay somewhere like Canaport if there's a spill. So how much safer is it really going to be? How much safer is it really going to be? The stuff isn't going to float on top of the water. One thing I will say that will be better or would be better...I won't say will, because we're not going to accept it here...but it would be a bit better where seabirds are concerned. There would not be so much oiling of seabirds, where there wouldn't be so much floating on the surface. But, there still would be oily of seabirds.

Anyway, I want to get onto our recommendations tonight, because I think we talked about a lot of things. And, I know it's been a long meeting here...but, particularly where we're recommending not going ahead with Orimulsion® that we do have to recommend something else. And, the status quo is not good enough. We're going to recommend something close to the status quo, but with lots of environmental protections and clauses around it. So I guess I'll get down to the nitty gritty here.

I would like to say in no uncertain terms the position of the Conservation Council of New Brunswick that Coleson Cove should not be converted to Orimulsion®. Coleson Cove should be switched to burning a low sulphur oil. An oil blend that would reduce the sulphur currently coming out of the plant. And, also what needs to happen in conjunction to that is that NO_x burners to reduce nitrogenous oxide emissions to the atmosphere should be put in place. Now those two things have to happen. And in the short term, the immediate term, that is the best option. And, the cost of that given by these people to the Public Utilities Board is somewhere around $97,000 versus $750,000 in capital costs without overruns with what they want to do with Orimulsion®. So, let's see how it adds up over the long term.

Action must also begin…right now…in getting plans in place to install a new 400 megawatt combined natural gas electrical generating station. Now how many people want that? Is that what people want or people want Orimulsion®? (Clapping)

We realize there are electrical needs here. We realize that perhaps there aren't as big an electrical need as we're being told. They can also cut back significantly on exports, which was mentioned to the credit of the people on the panel there tonight.

We have another bunch of recommendations of secondary recommendations to that. Now recommendation #2 is beginning immediately NB Power oil purchase contracts be required to specify that the oil be delivered to Saint John for the Coleson Cove Generating Station by double-hulled oil tankers only.

Recommendation #3 – the section of the oil pipeline to Coleson Cove, which currently runs beneath the Saint Rests Marsh must be relocated to lands above the high water level of the Bay of Fundy. (Clapping)

Recommendation #4 – additional air monitors must be put in place in the communities of Saint John, Lorneville and Musquash and an comprehensive monitoring program for airborne depositions must be established. Improved monitoring capability is essential to protecting public health and the natural environment. (Clapping) However, any improved air monitoring system must be developed in corporation with local communities and environmental groups. (Clapping)

Recommendation #5 – no monitoring has been carried out to determine the extent of the Coleson Cove's impact on juvenile fish, marine species and larvae from capture and entrainment in the plant's saltwater cooling system. And these studies need to be done…and improvements carried out if results are found.

Recommendation #6 – in the near future the City of Saint John intends to draw all of its industrial water supply from the Musquash Watershed. And, I'd like to touch a little bit…I'll talk a little bit about this, because people we're talking about water supply and demand before. But, they were only talking about the availability of water for drinking and for use at the power plant. But there's a lot more uses. And, of course as we know now the Loch Alva area is one of eight special protected areas that are going to be put in place by the Province of New Brunswick under the Protected Spaces Campaign, it's part of the Protected Areas Strategy for the whole country. It's New Brunswick's contribution. So, we have to look at much more than if there's going to be enough water for the plant or drinking supply. We can't go to the City of Saint John and ask them how much they need for drinking. What we've got to consider is all those bogs around all of those lakes, 50 or so lakes, big or small in the Musquash system and all those freshwater marshes around there. What drawing down that on a continuing basis for excess periods of time, particularly sensitive time periods of the year…for the reproduction and the feeding of species there…fish species, plant species and others.? That's the serious concern there. That's the concern and you know to look at in a simplistic way…that's why I don't have any confidence in these people. I mean these people serving on these environmental assessment group for the Power Commission. Their consultants, these people are biologists. They understand that, but they're just looking at in a very simplistic manner. We can't do that. This is one of the protected areas and everything that happens has to be thought of in managing that protective area over a long period of time and ensuring the environmental stability of it and all the plants and species of it contained within. So, I'll continue on with the recommendation…

The Environmental Impact Assessment Report only addresses the increased water use and the draw down of the Musquash Watershed by the Coleson Cove plant and not the cumulative effect of increased demand by Coleson Cove combined with the total industrial demand for the City of Saint John in the near future. And, they intend to draw all the industrial water from here and use the Loch Lomond system for drinking. That means a lot of water is coming out of there. And these people have not looked at the cumulative impacts, although it was required to be looked at in the Guidelines for the Environmental Impact Assessment Review. I haven't seen any comments from the Technical Review body on that either. They just sort of approved what these guys had done. I mean, you know the Conservation Council and the Lorneville citizens group have shot holes in all this tonight, and with no resources to do so and with very little time. We've all been working on other projects in the last month, mostly us working in legal hearings before the Public Utilities Board. And, it's disgraceful that this is happening…but, anyways it needs to be looked at….the whole management of the Musquash

Watershed has to looked from an environmental perspective, not for drinking water of the City only or water for their industrial plant and perhaps greedier needs in the future. We have to look at how we're going to maintain that system…that system of habitat there and that's what really needs to be looked at. The combined impact on water levels in the various water bodies within the Musquash Watershed must be identified.

Recommendation #7 – furthermore, the cumulative effect of increased water use and its impact on wetland habitat and species within the Loch Alva Protected Area must also be studied and clearly identified.

Recommendation #8 – Development in the Shannon Lake Watershed north of the Coleson Cove plant presents a direct risk to the Musquash Estuary and the Marine Protected Area. Therefore, any additional development in the Shannon Watershed must be prohibited.

Recommendation #9 – Shannon Brook must be monitored on a regular basis through development of a monitoring program to ensure protection of the Musquash Marine Protected Area and Estuary from pipeline leaks and runoff from current existing infrastructure from the Coleson Cove plant. And, I'm not talking about new stuff. I'm talking about those tanks and that pipe that's there right now and they better get a monitoring program in place there fast. That should have been happening there years ago.

Recommendation #10 – different government departments and people have to know all the information and the full information…they can't be getting one set of information one group from this people to obtain a permit from them…then walking over to another decision making body who they want to get a permit from and giving them a different line. And, we don't want to see that to continue to occur. So, recommendation #10 says: a firm ongoing communication liaison and information sharing link must be established between the New Brunswick Utilities Board and the New Brunswick Environment Department. This would ensure that the same set of facts and information are presented to both regulatory agencies by applicants, such as NB Power who come before both bodies separately to seek recommendation and approval for projects with very large financial and environmental risks. (Clapping)

So these recommendations are all recommendations that need to go in place without Orimulsion®. Either they're recommendations that have to go in place to clean up the process of how decisions are made. They're recommendations that have to go in place, because we're going to have to run that Coleson Cove plant for awhile and the best way to run it is with cleaner oil, NO_x burners and a number of environmental conditions, which I just outlined in the regulations while we build a new natural gas plant. Thank you. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much Mr. Thompson. The next registered participant is Frank Hogan of the Public Interest Project. Mr. Hogan.

FRANK HOGAN

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to make a presentation this evening. I will be brief. There are many points that I could make, but I've narrowed it down to three issues that I would like to briefly address. First I'll introduce myself...my name is Frank Hogan. I'm with a new organization in this area called the Public Interest Project, which as its names suggests gets involved in issues, community issues that may have a significant public interest component. We certainly believe that this is one of them. I am a lawyer by profession, however, I'm not really here in the role of a lawyer tonight. I've been working pro bono so to speak in the area of environmental assessments approximately 15 years now, and I guess my impression of these certain types of assessments is that they are certainly not fair. They're certainly not open and they're certainly not transparent. At least from a legal perspective I don't see that. The decision maker is not in the room. It's not an administrative tribunal type setting. We're not cross-examining the experts. I know that was partially done in the Public Utility Board Hearing. But, that's only a partial crossover with what an Environmental Assessment really should do. So, I'm here simply tonight to make a couple of points and hope that will eventually make its way up to the real decision makers who are eventually going to make a final decision on this Project in a closed room. And, we will never know what each member in that Cabinet voted on this decision. We'll simply know was it approved or not approved. And that to me is not a fair, open and transparent process.

The three points or the issues I want to address this evening are...first a few points on CO_2 or climate change, global warming...which, to me probably the most glaring error that is contained in this Project proposal. The second point that I want to address as some people asked tonight what is the real agenda here? Or what I would call a partially hidden agenda on the part of NB Power. And the third point is basically dealing with the supply of Orimulsion® from Venezuela. And I'd like to make a few points on how unreliable and unsecure I believe that supply truly is.

So on the point of CO_2, our global warming issue…I'm going to refer to an article that just came out two weeks ago, July 12 in "The Economist" magazine. And, I'm going to refer to this magazine in a couple of points tonight, because I believe it's one of the most conservative anti-environmental magazines in the world. I read it all the time, but it really is not a friend to the environmental movement. So when they identify an issue that needs to be addressed in an environmental perspective, I take that as something very serious. And the cover story in *The Economist* two weeks ago was "CO_2AL is Environmental Enemy NO. 1". And that is the issue that is so glaringly not dealt with in any way, shape or form. When I read the report, there's a mention of maybe there would be a 4% reduction in CO_2, but look at all the other reductions. I simply as a citizen can not accept that we would build a plant today that would not address CO_2 any significant way. (Clapping) That report in *The Economist* has about a 20 page global environmental survey in it and one of the main articles is entitled: "Blowing Hot & Cold: Climate Change May Be Slow and Uncertain, But That Is No Excuse For Inaction." *The Economist* magazine doesn't even accept that the Kyoto Protocol is an acceptable international treaty. It wants something less than the Kyoto Protocol, but it does go on to state that we need to live in a low carbon world today. And, one of the issues it talks about is the form in which carbon in the ground is distributed. And, one of course, the dirtiest form is coal and coal-like substances such as the tar sands in Alberta and Orimulsion® in Venezuela. And, it says specifically in theory we could burn all of the conventional oil and natural gas in the ground and still meet ambitious goals for tackling climate change. In theory, but if we do that, we must ensure that the far greater amounts of carbon trapped as coal and unconventional resources such like tar sands, never enter the atmosphere. We're in a new world where we have to take global warming seriously and things that we considered in the past such as do we dig up that tar sands…how do we get that Orimulsion® out and burn it and use it? They just may be off the table now even with the best technology you want to put in scrubbers and precipitators, so that the CO_2 is somehow caught. Not this proposal will do that, but there saying somewhere down the road will be able to get that CO_2 so it doesn't enter the environment. This proposal…this Project doesn't do anything on CO_2 and to me that is a disgrace. (Clapping)

The second issue I'd like to address briefly, is what I think is the real agenda here. As its been stated Orimulsion® is not used anywhere else in North America, other than the one plant existing now in New Brunswick. And I ask is that because so much …or that we are so much smarter here than all these other areas? Or are we really the foot in the door? Are we the guinea pigs? I'd like to refer to a publication that was put out by the Florida Clean Air Network, called FCAN. And, there's a quotation in that publication…I've supplied that with the materials…where it states that: "Bitor Inc". which is the company that controls Orimulsion® through the state oil company in Venezuela…"has negotiated"…and this was several years ago. "has negotiated a sweetheart deal with Florida Power & Light and the Venezuelan Government to assure a cheaper source for fuel for it's power plants in an effort to"…and this is what I think is so critical, because it's exactly what I think is happening in New Brunswick today. "In an effort to undercut future competitors as the electric industry restructures and deregulates power companies, including potential privatization." That's the agenda. Let's lock ourselves into a cheap source of oil, so if we sell a unit or if we restructure or break up the cogeneration or generation units from the distribution lines, whatever we do…guess what? We've locked ourselves into this long-term contract and isn't that great. Well, that's exactly what Florida rejected on environmental grounds. I would hope that New Brunswick has the common sense, the good sense to do exactly the same thing. (Clapping)

On this issue of what is the real agenda…we heard from Capt. Donovan this evening about the power plants in United Kingdom that have since shutdown. Well, its interesting to note that within two months after the contract or the agreement was signed for NB Power to have a 20 year supply of Orimulsion®. They, Bitor Europe Limited was using that fact in all of their marketing documents…and I have a copy of the document they presented to the Cabinet in England on why United Kingdom should reconsider and get back in the Orimulsion® business. And it said…and this documented pointed out that there were three areas in the world last year that signed Orimulsion® agreements. A) Power Seraya, which is based in Singapore. They bought 1.5 million tonnes per year for 10 years starting in 2004; then of course there was the Chinese National Petroleum Corporation, agreed to buy 6.5 million tonnes per year for 30 years starting in 2004 and what's there third great example? NB Power of New Brunswick, Canada with 1.6 million tonnes per year for 20 years starting in 2004. Now, I guess I just find it very comforting that we are in the company of Singapore and China, those known great environmental countries, those bastions of democracy to buy all this Orimulsion®. (Clapping)

My last point or my third point concerns the supply and the cost of Orimulsion®. Venezuela is the only source of Orimulsion® in the world. We heard that. Now I also do some human rights work and so I have become increasingly familiar with the situation in Venezuela and I would suggest that it is very, very far from stable down there. Once again, I use want I consider to be the conservative source of *The Economist* and provided you with two recent articles, both in the last 3 or 4 months. The first one is four months old now I guess, March of 2002...and, it's entitled "On Trouble Waters-Venezuela's State Oil Company Refuses To Serve President Hugo Chavez's Revolution." And, as people may know there was actually a coo in Venezuela three months ago and President Chavez was forced out of office for a few days. Some said he resigned. Some said he was forced out. But, we know the military was involved. And we know that a democratically elected president was kicked out for a few days, and is now back in. And that President is fighting with Venezuela's state oil company and the oil company is trying to bolt from this supposedly democratically elected leader. And I would just like to read from that article briefly: "Venezuela's state oil company refuses to serve President Chavez's revolution. In the quarter century since its nationalization, the Venezuelan oil industry has remained relatively immuned to the party political infighting and crooningism that has done so much to damage the rest of Venezuelan society...

10:20 P.M.

(END OF TAPE 2/SIDE 4))

...are directly related to oil and oil type products such as Orimulsion®. So this is huge down there and the President is fighting with the state owed oil company. And in the last years since this populist former army officer came to power, he sought to place that Latin America's largest company at the service of his revolution. He's placed in power a fellow...I won't go into the details, but basically he's a leftist academic who recently became Chairman of the state owned oil company and he's the fourth Chairman that Chavez has had to appoint because of the fighting. And he was...this Mr. Peril was among those responsible for a controversial new hydrocarbons law, which was seen as a virtual death blow to prospects in foreign investment I the oil industry down there. This guy who has no managerial experience is also an enemy of this oil company's independence. The Directors of this new Board that he chairs have left as many as six or eight levels in the hierarchy with no management experience and are regarded by many unprepared for the task of running a company. I simply bring this up to say this place is in a state of turmoil, especially when it comes to oil. On the day the Board was sworn in recently, senior managers held an extraordinary press conference at which among other things, "they accused the government of pushing this oil company to the verge of operational and financial collapse". However the President has dismissed their complaints and he said "if anyone is discontented they can go get a job with Shell or VP", and I would add to that perhaps, NB Power. (Clapping)

I'll just conclude on this article that goes on to say: "At first the managers stressed that they would stay in their posts, but there appeared to be a real danger that without Government concessions, the whole industry could be brought to a halt….and the economy was further battered by the fall in oil price and a full stoppage of the industry would cost Venezuela $45 million dollars a day." So, that was the state of the oil industry down there about three months ago.

Then I got a further article, which is April of 2002 and basically it describes how the United States is in favour of having President Chavez removed from office. So we've got the United States, President Chavez and the state owned oil company, who do you think is going to win this battle over the next couple of years? We certainly at a minimum, can state that we don't know. If you are putting your Orimulsion® agreement in place with a single country, which is the only one you can deal with and yet say in your environmental report that the three things that you want to do…the three most important things that this conversion operation or option will enable "NB Power to fulfill its commitment to the Province by providing reliable, clean and affordable electricity to all New Brunswickers." "Reliable" and "affordable" are no longer on the table as of a few months ago. And "clean" is not a word that you can use with the word Orimulsion®. You can't use those together. (Clapping)

I'd just like to conclude now, then I'll ask one question, if I might. As I understand it the current plan has an existing lifespan to the year 2017, if you don't do any refurbishment.

Therefore, in my opinion there is no need to rush this refurbishment. We keep hearing the date 2005 and there are legitimate environmental targets that have to be reached by 2005. However, the argument that we have to have this done because Point Lepreau is going to go off line, is not a really convincing argument. The plant could remain online right now with no refurbishment through the Point Lepreau closure or decommissioning or refurbishment, whatever is going to happen there. It could also be converted at a much cheaper cost to a combination of cleaner fuels as I understand it. I don't know the economics very well. But I understand that this plant could be converted for $90 million versus $750 million and be burning cleaner fuel and still be able to be burning it while Point Lepreau goes offline.

So, if we don't have to make this critical decision and jeopardize our entire CO_2 future now, then why should we? Lets not make that decision at this time. And I think in a couple of years, the natural gas option will clarify whether its another lateral pipeline, whether its liquefied natural gas or gas in whatever form. It will be clear in several years what your supply possibilities are going to be. And maybe NB Power could actually take an active role in ensuring that that gas is here, not just for private companies, but for our public utility. (Clapping)

So I would say that we in New Brunswick have an opportunity right now to make a real difference in what most would agree is our globe's greatest threat – that's climate change and global warming. The building, refurbishment or closing of power plants are our golden opportunities. We don't get these opportunities. These are big changes where you can do big things. And this is an opportunity to do the right thing and not just to play around the edges, and talk about a little bit of wind power here and a little bit of another type of power here…and a little less exports and we'll somehow meet CO_2 requirements down the road. I don't think that that really is a serious position to take. And I would like the Province to speak with actions and not just with words, and not to lose this opportunity. (Clapping)

Just in terms of one question, it is a very long night, but I was reading in the materials that when this type of plant and energy usage was proposed for Florida, the Florida was estimating that if they used Orimulsion® it would save their customers approximately $3 a month on their electric bills. I'm just wondering if we have any sense what savings with this Project being approved are we as customers going to see?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

You're looking for an answer…not hypothetical? And that should be answered by NB Power. That should be answered by NB Power.

FRANK HOGAN

Yes, please

GAETAN THOMAS

Well our rates are at different levels in the Province of New Brunswick. What we know today is that the export business is representative of 10-15% rate equivalent to the New Brunswickers today. Now we have industrial rates, residential rates and we have general business rates…so there's various rates. So that is not available as I speak on the various different rates. But, 10-15% could be enough to drive some business out of the Province, I mean from a rate perspective. That's the best answer I can give you there. The…you know you had a lot of comments and concerns and I appreciate hearing them…you know there are issues, which must be corrected a little bit in respect to the performance of Orimulsion®. We have addressed the plan of CO_2, other than Coleson Cove…so we've been upfront about that from day one. The requirement is 1000 megawatts, so it's not easy to come with a 100 megawatts even with natural gas. The economics that people are referring to with the blending option, although it looks like a $90 million investment, the difference in cost between the two options is actually $400 million dollars on a net present value. So I'd just like to correct that fact and that the low blend option will not address particulate. And will not address a lot of the other issues. I'll keep it brief, because it has been a long night. This Project provided you know the opportunity to have $436 million worth of pollution control. Opportunity for improved air quality monitoring stations and a lot of other things. We also have the capability to go back in the future to a lower sulphur oil or heavy fuel oil with all these heavy pollution control equipment in service. So the Project paid for all that equipment. And the air would definitely be cleaner as a result of this Project. We demonstrated that and we are planning to address the CO_2 responsibly as a representative of the people of New Brunswick. We're committed to that.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir, has your question been answered?

FRANK HOGAN

In terms of a specific question, I guess I was asking from residential customer point of view….now today, before the Project is approved…my monthly bill says so much, whether its civic hydro or NB Power…so much per month on average. Is there a cost that you can state today that says if this Project is approved, every customer of NB Power will see their bill reduced by X dollars per month?

GAETAN THOMAS

I can't say that today, because there are a number other issues and we are saying that it would maintain stable rates for our customers,

FRANK HOGAN

Yeh, maintain and don't deal with CO_2. It's a bad combination in my view. Thank you. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you very much, Sir. Thank you very much, Sir. There is one more registered presenter, Marlene Ross, a concerned citizen as I have it here…Ms. Ross…thank you.

MARLENE ROSS

Good evening Mr. Chairman and everyone. Although not here, I say hello to the Minister of Environment and the Premier of New Brunswick. My name is Marlene Ross. I am a concerned citizen. I live Martinon. I've stood and sat at government tables for six years fighting pollution. We all know the mess we have now at the Crane Mountain dump, a money pit of expense and destruction. I'm glad to see so many people here tonight, but I choose not to call people for this meeting, because the work has already been done by us. All documented for you to read…municipal, provincial and federally. The one thing I find that is not used in

Government, be it from your chair or others…is your common sense or your conscience (Clapping) for you to take into your own hands…judgement to go ahead and destroy our god given rights to clean environment is unforgivable in the eyes of Man and in the eyes of God. It doesn't make any difference to me whose government it was to sign the paper to destroy beautiful air, land, brooks, lakes, streams and beaches, when that Crane Mountain dump was built. The difference is that example has been given time and time again. It is up to you to take the initiative and stop further destruction and preserve what is left for the future of mankind. An old Indian saying: "Man goes by the way of animals" has proven itself. Are we to wait until sickness overtakes all of us? On behalf of the people that do care about breathing fresh air and drinking clean water and eating fresh food of fish, meat and fruit and vegetables…I implore you to deny the use of this known dirtiest fuel in the world (??? 104 – Tape 3/Side 5) at Coleson Cove. (Clapping) Remember God has given you the brains and the ability to do so, please use them.

I mentioned that all our work has been documented. Who among you will read our reports, which include all regarding air, water, etc.? Is there anyone here that will read one of my reports? Or any of those people who wrote them?

GAETAN THOMAS

Yes, we will.

MARLENE ROSS

Have you ever looked at them before you came down here tonight, regarding the situation of this area, myself being included in Martinon called the Greater Saint John Area?

GAETAN THOMAS

I haven't seen the Reports. I haven't read it, but I will.

MARLENE ROSS

It's a shame that you haven't. And to those that are dealing directly with the environment department, have you not?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

I have read lots of studies, lots of reports, but I have not read yours no.

MARLENE ROSS

My study…no…have you read David Bowen's or any of the people's here from Lorneville?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

No I haven't, if they had provided those to me I would have read them. Thank you.

MARLENE ROSS

Well, honey you gotta look. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

That was the end of your presentation Mrs. Ross….(Yes, it is) Thank you. Thank you very much that was the last of the registered presenters. If there are people who would like to have further say, please come to the microphones and you'll be recognized. There was a lady at the microphone #3 first and I will ask her to have her say first.

SANDY ROSS

My name is Sandy Ross and I am a member of the Musquash LSD. However, I'd like to stated for the record that I am speaking as a private citizen. And my question is to all six of you at that table…if Orimulsion® was being burned in the town that you lived in, which side of the table would you be on tonight? I'll start with you at the end…in the jacket…if it was going to be burned in your town, would you be sitting there or would you be here with us.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Umm…I'm just going to say that I'm here as Chairperson only and (Laughter)…

SANDY ROSS

My question is done. Thank you.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I believe that the next person at the microphone was at #5, Ms. Weir.

ELIZABETH WEIR

Thank you very much. I actually have a couple of questions after listening to the presentation tonight and I was able to attend part of the meeting last week in Saint John. I would hope by now that you would realize that residents of this region have borne the consequences of inadequate standards for air pollution, contamination and lax enforcement by the Department of Environment for years. And it isn't just private industry, but one of the largest culprits has been NB Power, both at Coleson Cove where for a decade the pollution abatement equipment was not properly operated…and of course at Courtenay Bay as well. In our region, puffers in classrooms are as common as chalk. (Clapping) Our health care system in this region is burdened by adults and children with respiratory ailments. So, what we're looking for from a public utility. What we're looking for is next century energy sources, not last century energy sources that have given us some of the worse respiratory rates for illness and deaths in the country. And that's a message we want you take to the Provincial Cabinet.

Now I'm interested in hearing you talk about needing 1000 megawatts and we know that poor little PEI manages to come up with 500 megawatts using wind energy…and, neither conservation nor wind energy has been at least in the documents I've seen or in any of your presentations. I absolutely support natural gas. And NB Power has been asleep at the wheel…and, you want us to bear the consequences of your bad decision making. But, even the Conservation Council presentation…you may have seen those wind turbines…that's old technology. In Germany, in Denmark, they're using second generation wind turbines so that there's less noise pollution and less shadow. But, you know what you talked about wanting to create jobs. With these new wind turbines, you know you need a special place to build those things. You need a facility that has high technology. You know the kind of facility that we have at Saint John Shipbuilding is exactly the kind (Clapping) that could build those arms. So we'll tell you if you want to create jobs, how you can do it and how you can contribute to not producing pollution, not contributing to greenhouse gas emissions.

But, I'm going to wrap up…now I know you have to make a recommendation to Cabinet…you know Cabinet is really busy you know…they do things like having to spend a lot of time giving property tax credits and breaks to big industry…so we'll help you take the message back to Cabinet on this proposal for Orimulsion® and the message is quite clear – this dog won't hunt. But, (Clapping) I have two questions…because this Project all along…you've told us requires Cabinet approval.

It seems you have negotiated an agreement with Bitor, the Venezuelan company that produces the dirtiest fuel in the world. We kind of see the blacked out portions now. My question to NB Power or to anyone who wants to answer it…in that agreement for the purchase of fuel from Bitor, is there a provision that says we can get out of that agreement for no penalty whatsoever, because its contingent on approval by Cabinet.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Do you want an answer to that question first or do you want a…..

ELIZABETH WEIR

I want an answer to that question.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

So that's NB Power's question.

GAETAN THOMAS

Yes, all our term sheets and agreements would contain a conditional to EIA and Cabinet approval.

ELIZABETH WEIR

O.K. So there's no penalty clause…not one cent will we pay to get out of that agreement if Cabinet refuses to give you the green light?

GAETAN THOMAS

As far as no…no

ELIZABETH WEIR

But, of course we don't know because we can't see the agreement. Now…

GAETAN THOMAS

No, there's no penalty.

ELIZABETH WEIR

O.K. My second question is because you did talk a little bit about wind energy…and we do know NB Power's huge commitment to wind energy was $40,000 last year. You said tonight that you've already spent $30 million on this Project. Could you tell us what you have spent $30 million on without Cabinet approval? (Clapping)

GAETAN THOMAS

We have to do some engineering to realize what we needed to accomplish for a Project of that magnitude. There was a lot of engineering involved and there was also some Orimulsion® issues. We also had to go through the PUB process and we needed information…you know we just don't take information hearsay, or small facts…we have to put it together and we have to do all the scientific studies, all the engineering analysis and so on. I mean there is a number of issues with a Project of that size that requires that preliminary engineering. And that was done over a period of 13 months and really you know…was determined to be viable by the PUB and our Board of Directors agreed to spend that engineering…to get it so far to present it to the EIA process and to the public.

ELIZABETH WEIR

And, without Cabinet approval now…my question is will you provide an accounting…a public accounting…the provide the statements as you normally would to members of the Crown Corporations Committee, so that we can just get a better sense of the relative expenditures that are included in that $30 million?

GAETAN THOMAS

Well, I'm not the Finance Department, I'm the Project Director…I think obviously we should be able to give you some details…

ELIZABETH WEIR

I would think so. Thank you very much. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I'm not sure now whether the person at #5 microphone or #2 was next…so, if you're standing sir…go ahead.

FRED HASLAM

The first thing I want to say is I would like to congratulate the committee that worked on this…they're working on little to no money at all…and what they said made a lot more sense than what you people have said having millions of dollars behind you. (Clapping)

Just a little history on myself…I moved to Lorneville in 1950. When I moved down here I could fish in brooks. I could breath the air. And, we had people at our home that came from different parts of the world and every time they came to Lorneville, they said "Boys, the air is some clean here." I want to tell you its not clean here today. If you people would like to come over and have a look at my deck, you'll see all kinds of black on it. Now this black…I'll just give you a little story…now this is a true story. My daughter was in Fredericton. She was in a hospital in Fredericton doing a survey. One doctor said come here and have a look at this guy's lungs. She went over and looked and they were blacker than this. She said, "boys he must be a heavy smoker…oh no, no, he never smoked in his life". Well she said "what's his problem? He said "he's from Saint John." Oh my soul…where does all this dirt come from? A lot of it from right down here in Coleson Cove. Because I see it on my deck. I can go and wipe my hand on the dash of my truck and it's black. This is what we're breathing in and you people up there…or whosever running this organization…I don't know…you heart and your brains doesn't work together…because you have no care for the people of this community or the City of Saint John or the surrounding areas. This is something boys you have to get into your mind that the people is the ones that's paying the bills and paying your salary. You got to keep them alive or you fellows aren't going to have a job. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you, Sir…now we'll go to microphone #2. Madame, if you'll give your name also.

DR. PAULA TIPPETT

Dr. Tippett. I started my presentation at the last meeting, but I didn't get….

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Can I just interrupt you for a second? Be careful of the floor, will you? It's quite slippery now.

DR. PAULA TIPPETT

…didn't get a chance to finish it, so…I'm not going to finish it tonight because it's about 15 pages and I know people don't want to stay here all night and listen to it. But there was one point that I thought was really important. Somebody was saying…I could hear them before…I couldn't get a seat because all the seats were full, but in the hallway when I was standing out there I thought I heard somebody say that vanadium was required for human…for people and that it was a good thing. I just wanted to correct that. It think that it's important for people to know that vanadium is poisonous and that they shouldn't eat it. (Laugher…clapping) In discussing the toxicity assessment for vanadium we did a …I went through the Health Risk Assessment that was done for the Environmental Impact Assessment…and that was the only thing I had access to and I only had access to it for a short time of a borrowed copy…so my report is only 15 pages. But, it's a critique of that study, because I thought there were a lot of flaws in it. And one of thing was when he was talking about the toxicity of vanadium, he didn't seem to take into account the health effects of vanadium that were noted in the NIOSH criteria document and other sources. There are a lot of …those were sources he mentioned that he referred to, but he didn't really address what was in them.

Vanadium fumes cause running nose, nose bleeds, coughs, shortness of breath, acute asthmatic bronchitis and these are familiar to many of my patients that have been exposed to vanadium contained in air pollution for many years. And, of course, Saint John air pollution is a chemical soup. It's not just the vanadium that is making them sick. There are other things in the air as well. When absorbed vanadium goes to the bone, liver, spleen, intestines and is excreted by kidney and can be accumulated, especially in bone. It crosses the placenta barrier to the fetus and maybe muted genetic and cause abnormalities in bones. A long time is necessary in order to completely eliminated vanadium from the body. So accumulation likely occurs from a low level chronic exposure. Saint Johners have been exposed to vanadium for years as 90% of vanadium in the air comes from burning oil or coal and the oil used at Coleson Cove contains vanadium. And the Orimulsion® that is proposed to be used here also contains vanadium. I think that is important to clarify for people. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Dr. Tippett. I presume that you will be sending your entire report to the Department of Environment. And I'm going to take this opportunity to mention that anyone who wishes to make a written presentation to the Department. These forms are available at the back of the room. You can use these forms or any other means to send a written submission. And these submissions will need to be sent by August 14, which is 15 days from today.

Madame, were you at #1 microphone or…yes, you would be the next speaker then.

TINA GALLANT

I'm Tina Gallant and I'm a concerned citizen as well. I'm new to the Lorneville area, but this is definitely a concern for me. I don't have the education as some of the…I'm not saying I'm stupid either but (laughs), but I don't have the education most had with the reports and such… but, you don't have to be that educated to know that Orimulsion® is very hazardous to your health. My concern is for my children and my fellow citizens here…that is when you did your report Mr. Thomas is it? Gaetan or…Thomas O.K. Anyway, you had mentioned a lot of guarantees with the Orimulsion® conversion. I was just wondering if you'd be able to guarantee that they're wouldn't be any deterioration to our or our children's health once this Orimulsion® plant is set in place?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

That's a question you'd like someone to comment on?

TINA GALLANT

Yes, please.

GAETAN THOMAS

I'm not a doctor myself and you know we hired people, toxicologists that done these kinds of assessments from a very reputable company…and the risk to the health is reduced as a result of burning Orimulsion® with $436 million worth of pollution control equipment. So vanadium, fine particulate will be reduced, will be less than what is emitted today. So that's…you know from a citizen's point of view the risk is reduced. That's all I can comment on. If you want me…

TINA GALLANT

Like you said it's from a citizens' point of view, not the actual facts…because it would be easy for someone to believe that if they were just a common citizen, but if we had actual reports…because, I notice also in your report that it was a lot of just titles and you didn't go into any explanation at all…everything was just all fancy and pretty…it kind of fades over time, which this will if it goes into place. There's another thing as well…another thing I noticed during the talks tonight is that everybody seems to be sitting there pretty smugly like this is a done deal, as well as with a lot of money spent out on it. My main concern was is I'm hearing a lot from men that work down at Coleson Cove itself and there's a lot of talk going on down there that this is already done. And that everything is starting up in September. They're pretty convinced. I'm just wondering what would give them that idea. And they said that this was basically just a formality, this public hearing. I'd hate to think I spent this much time away from my children just to sit here and play along with the game. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Madame. I'm going to ask someone from the Department of the Environment to give a response to your last point.

PERRY HAINES

This public process is not just a formality. It is part of the regulated Environmental Impact Assessment process and no it's not just a rubber stamping. There will be a process. This public process last week and this week will be taken into consideration as it goes to Cabinet. And Cabinet has to approve it and they have not.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Madame…

TINA GALLANT

…that I am not convinced. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I believe that microphone #5 was the next person. Madame would you identify yourself?

ELSIE RUSTLING

My name is Elsie Rustling. I'm a resident of …have been a resident of Lorneville all my life. I'm a housewife, a mother and a grandmother and I have great concerns for the future of my grandchildren and all of our grandchildren here. If we go back to 1971, which I'm sure some of you know, but perhaps not all of you…at which time we went through the expropriation. The area of Lorneville, known as Seaview was decimated at that time. And, from that terrible thing we read in the paper…that's how people found out then we went through an issue of rezoning for heavy industry. Next was the dump we had here for 18 years. The City of Saint John dump and we still have that in our backyards so to speak, which is really a bubbly inferno we don't know what's coming out of it in the years to come. Then of course, we had to fight the landfill issue. They wanted to give us a landfill, which we're certainly glad we didn't get…because it's not working out very well. Then they came along with the Free Trade Zone that would be good for us. Now we're here with Orimulsion®, which I would call a garbage fuel. Then not only that how do you think we felt when we read they were going to give us a landfill? After all we've been through with landfills, that's the last thing we ever wanted to hear. (Clapping)

Now, we should be able to depend on the Department of Environment to do the right thing, but the question is can we depend on them to really look at this issue and vote after serious consideration to vote with their hearts and not how they're told to vote. And another thing, I was surprised to hear that the local government, which is the City of Saint John, just happens to be the Provincial Government…isn't that a strange thing to call the Provincial Government the Local Government

(VOICE IN BACKGROUND)

Environment and Local Government

ELSIE RUSTLING

You know with all that we have been through here…and a lot of people would agree…it sure seems like harassment to me. We can never ever relax. It would be lovely if we could just enjoy our homes, enjoy our families, but no there's always another issue. And we do wish it would end. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I don't believe I see anybody else at the microphones on the side, so I believe you sir were standing to come to a microphone.

HEBERT IKEMAN

I beg your pardon sir, my hearing isn't what it used to be 80 years ago.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I believe you wanted to say something that you did go to microphone for that purpose. Would you identify yourself and..?

HERBERT IKEMAN

My name is Herbert Ikeman. I live in Dominion Park since I came to Canada after I turned my back on Europe because I didn't think democracy would have a great future in Europe at the time. Tonight is the third time that I have partaken or participated in an event that has really enforced the belief that I made the right decision to come to Canada. I would personally like to congratulate the three representatives of NB Power to sit there and had to take all the flack they heard here tonight. Matter of fact they probably feel like I did when I had my crate perfervid by a Spitfire in the Second World War. Now they of course are loyal citizens of their employers, which is the NB Power Commission and everybody here knows that the NB Power Commission is situated between a hard place and rock. And every employee, whoever he may be at whatever level... his obligation is to help extricate NB Power from this situation. Therefore, I would say these people are very brave and deserve some commendations…maybe even some applause…for sitting there and commonly taking it in this fashion.

But, whether they actually believe what they are trying to defend is really not important right now. Because the people who actually draw up policy and direct the ship of the Power Commission in such a way as to extricate themselves… have all the reasons to believe that it is important to influence all politicians, first of all to see the politicians of New Brunswick to see it their way, in order to help them get off the terrible situation they are in.

Now this does not reflect on the character of any people who feel they are obliged to speak in favour of the policy their company follows. So nobody should blame them for doing that. Likewise I would say those people who are really responsible have tried in the last six, seven months to … the whole panorama of problems including Lepreau and privatization, in order to destabilize the general population with information, which came from every angle you could think of…of NB Power contradicting themselves from day to day, and banding about statistics…of production, as well as finances…that really the ordinary citizen would have a hard time putting together and draw any conclusions from it. Therefore, many of the citizens who would have liked to be here today, would not come because they are too confused about what the issue is all about. This of course, is a very famous tool of anybody who is trying to sway either the general population or the politicians to help in their quest. Therefore, NB Power policy makers should just remember one thing: "the sins of the fathers should be visited on their children." Thank you. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you sir. Are there any further presentations…I don't see anybody at the microphones….it is I see past 11 O'clock of course…do people from the Department of Environment and Local Government wish to make some final comments.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

I may as well….alright….where do I start…I've got so many notes. As the Chairperson of the Technical Review Committee, I can not speak to any power policy, nor hidden agendas, nor Venezuelan environmental policy nor the energy policy for New Brunswick for that matter. What I can speak to is the Environmental Impact Assessment that was undertaken for this Project. And, while everyone says that Orimulsion® is the dirtiest fuel in the world…it may well be. We have a situation here where they are not proposing to burn an uncontrolled Orimulsion® here. The studies that were referenced throughout the evening from the United Kingdom. We have in fact seen those studies. Those studies came from burning Orimulsion® with no environmental controls. O.K. It's different from the situation here. What we have here is we have $400 and some odd million that is going to be spent on environmental controls. Now again I'm not speaking to whether we should go with natural gas, because all your comments have been understood and well made and we're going to present that to the Minister and on to Cabinet…what I'm speaking of is this review and whether it was a scientifically defensible review. And in fact the people that reviewed it indicated that it was so. Air quality monitoring is a science. It is a science that has been proven time and again my monitoring initiatives. I can ask one of our colleagues here from the Department of Environment…it's late, and I don't what to get into that to talk about previous monitoring that has happened at Lorneville. And many years when no environmental controls…that everyone was talking about…burning #6 fuel oil…and it shows that there were no impacts to the Lorneville community. (noise from the

audience)…if you'd like to discuss that…no, no, no…I'm just trying to explain…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I will ask to let Ms. Pataki-Theriault finish her comments.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

I listened to everyone's comments tonight and I would ask you to afford me the courtesy of listening to mine. What we've done is we've looked at all the different components that you guys were worried about. We were worried about the same things. The whole issue of is the Shannon Lake Watershed going to be protected? These are the kinds of things that we need to look at. So from an environmental perspective we have looked at that information. From a global CO_2 perspective…that has to go to Cabinet and they have to make that decision. But all I wanted to say tonight was that…and I could go into…people talk about indigene disruptors, there are no indigene disruptors in this particular…there are lots of things if you were to go and dig a little bit deeper…if you'd come and ask me, I've got all the studies…they are available at the Saint John office and you can come and read them all. All I wanted to say is that from an Environmental Impact Assessment perspective, we understand your concerns and we understand that natural gas would be better and we've asked NB Power to provide us a table a table with the…

11:05 P.M.

(END OF TAPE 3/SIDE 5)

…alternatives. And, it clearing indicates that…oh, look at that there are no spills in the Bay of Fundy if you use natural gas…absolutely. This is the kind of information that we wanted to have for Cabinet, not just here's Orimulsion®. We wanted to have a thorough analysis of alternatives and we're going to provide all this information that we're gathering here tonight to Cabinet for their decision making process.

(inaudible voice in background)

absolutely not…absolutely not. We've looked at the Environmental Impact Assessment of this Project. Now in the grander context, would natural gas be more logically? That's a decision Cabinet has to make. We were tasked with determining whether the Environmental Impact Assessment…We were tasked to determine whether this Project could be mitigated to such an extend that it is acceptable from an environmental, air quality perspective, from a water quality perspective, from a marine life perspective.

(WOMEN'S VOICE IN BACKGROUND)

You were comparing two dirty fuels.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

We have a distinct system, which is #6 fuel oil….

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

No, I think if people want to speak they should go to the microphones, please….are you finished…are you finished?

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

I'm done. Do you want to ask any more questions about the ……

DAVID THOMPSON

No, I don't…I won't ask any questions, because I don't want to get those kinds of answers, but I do want to say something….when I hear someone from the Department of Environment you know saying what you just started saying a few minutes ago…then I get really scared. I get really paranoid because I think that you know there are lot of decisions that have been made. I mean obviously people are not satisfied…many people…articulate people in the room here tonight are not satisfied with the work done by the Technical Review Committee. There have been issues that haven't been looked at that aren't in that report that just…if they have been looked at haven't been made available to the public to see. You know the matter of air quality in Lorneville or testing results in Lorneville or the community…I mean its ridiculous because we don' t have an adequate monitoring system here now. I mean what's anybody…can anybody provide me with a table of air monitoring results from Lorneville. No. Because there's no system here.

I mean we've got agencies in place that have…I guess lost the public trust…I guess is the only way I can put it. The Power Commission operated the Coleson Cove plant…they put in this marvellous system and there are some very same consultants who did work on Coleson Cove back when it was built…I see Mr. Gillis at the table there…same old face that I saw 30 years but only I'm a little bit greyer and so is he. But anyway, the systems were talked about and it was promised that they would work and things would be O.K.….you know people have mentioned to me tonight what public servants and politicians told them in a community meeting…well how many years ago in Lorneville…25-30 years ago, whatever it was anyway. And I mean that wasn't proven out. The plant did not perform…the pipes leading away from the precipitator were too small and they plugged up, caught the plant on fire two or three times there…so, then they just abandon it and spewed this stuff out into the air for about 10-12 years blackening the skies depending upon which the way the wind blew…perhaps Fundy Park to Grand Manan Island or further. People told me over in Nova Scotia that it was affecting their bodies, they're own reception of it their bodies….they could identify the effects when could see the plume blowing that way. And people refused to take action on that.

The Power Commission now, I mean I'm gonna…well I can't dig out the report now, I don't have to because you all know it at the table and I hope the other people in the room trust and believe what I'm saying. But if not, I will dig it out. But the Power Commission has been saying that they are going to shut down the plant at Grand Lake in 2003, the fiscal year 2003-2004, then low and behold during the last days of the Public Utilities Board information….we had come across information that wasn't made available to the public that NB Power had applied to operate that plant until the Year 2007. And, the information was concealed by the Environment Department and if it wasn't concealed by the Environment Department, than I expect a news release from you tomorrow morning you know saying that. I mean let's come clean with the public.

I mean this matter with all the oil leaks from the Irving pipeline that were found along parallel to it when the natural gas line was laid in Saint John. There's 500 truckloads of material that was taken for waste oil remediation. People weren't even told about it….so, the testing equipment isn't in place…the plant run…you know continue to be allowed to be run when it's not working, the pollution equipment on it…leaks are concealed…on and on. When are you are going to come clean? I mean it's matter of trust, I mean here we have these guys now holding out the plate of promises of double-hulled tankers so things are going to be better in the Bay of Fundy. Why the hell haven't they been using double tankers for the last five years? (Clapping) I mean they're available. (Clapping)

So the matter is really disturbing and its even more disturbing when it appears that you guys in the Environment Department…and, I say appears…are colluding with these guys. And the people that should have been at this table are not the people who are doing a sell job to the public…are trying to promote the interest and future well-being of NB Power if they can ever find that again…I don't know how they can because the company, if it was a private company would be bankrupted now…I think they had…something like losses for the last five years and probably for this year again due to the continuing ongoing problems they had at Lepreau. So, what integrity do they have?

These projects wouldn't even be going ahead. They wouldn't even by built across the border in the U.S. or anywhere else. Private companies could not raise the capital to do them only a Crown Corporation. The debt equity rate of NB Power wouldn't allow them to borrow on the junk bond as things stand now. I mean these are serious concerns. And when I hear someone saying well the Technical Review Committee's look at this…and when I hear you start to talk about levels of pollution in the community when there aren't air monitors and we don't know what they are…then there are serious problems. So I think the most serious problem in all this kind of thing now is the process and the way the decision is going to be made …

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

But sir, sir…

DAVID THOMPSON

…it's not only going to affect this Project, but there are several other projects in the Saint John area on the agenda right now. There's the Liquefied Natural Gas Project. There's the whole assessment which there trying to get away from doing at Lepreau by just looking at waste management and not all the effects of the operation of that plant. And there's a whole bunch of environmental assessments…and if we're going to have to face this kind of a format of bias people sitting on a panel in front of us, people who are not responsible for protecting either the health or legislatively responsible for protecting the health or environment of the people of New Brunswick or these communities…then we're in serious trouble. So, this process has got to change itself…

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir, you've made the point about the process a few times this evening already and they're already on the record, on the public record…every one of your words are going forward and there is no one hear who can change that process. That process is about the legislation…

DAVID THOMPSON

Well, there can be recommendations…there can be recommendations

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

There will be…

DAVID THOMPSON

….from this group to change the process

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

There will be…

DAVID THOMPSON

Because I'm recommending it right here…any citizen of New Brunswick or anybody in New Brunswick can recommend that…I mean it's not as if we've mandated this environmental assessment, but certainly people in the Environment Department can get together and recommend it be changed. And if people in the Power Commission want to do it can they support that recommendation too, as well Conservation Council or the seniors' group or the

Lorneville Community Group or Friends of Musquash or anybody else. And if we don't all get together on it and if we don't have the kind of decision making in New Brunswick that includes looking at the total picture that just doesn't include very limited and bias research done by a bunch paid consultants who have produced the same kind of studies for years and years on projects, which we've seen gone a foul. As I mentioned at the other meeting for a few years we had horrendous problems in East Saint John when the environmental assessment of this nature gave the clear go ahead to that Irving Lagoon for the mill. It seriously impacted all of the people in that area, particularly those living out on the street next to it there.

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

I need a few minutes….

DAVID THOMPSON

Anyhow, that's enough said, but it's serious when I see people defending this being done…people in the Environment Department who are supposed to at least be sitting there in neutrality then it causes a serious problem. Thank you. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

The lady that was at microphone #5 before you got up sir. O.K.

HELEN MARIE TREMBLAY

If there's one word in this world that gives me the heepie jeepies, it's process or process, however way you want to pronounce it. I have heard it now for the last 15 years. And, I've had it up to here. Doesn't anybody, just anybody think with a mind of their own?! Don't they stop to say what in the hell am I doing here? Is there any honesty left in me that I can pass onto my kids? Oh no, I gotta go by the process. I've been programmed…utterly programmed. So I must come here and I must sit and I must say all the rhetoric and all the good words, because I've got to go back to headquarters and if I don't do well and pay attention to all these little gizmos that have been stuck in my head, just like a laboratory rat, I'm going to be out of a job tomorrow and then what in the world am I going to do? Then you come around and you say is this $60,000, is this $70,000, is this $90,000 or even $150,000 worth it? Please God, as I stand here give those six people a brain, a heart and will to live. Thank you. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Sir, you have something to say? Number 6 I'm told was here first also so….

FRED HASLAM

I just have one comment to make…you people up there are trying to show that you have concern for us. I'd just like to ask you one question. Do any of you live in Woodstock or any of you ever visit there? Good, that's good. I'm glad you said that because they have a big Liar's Club up there every year and they do a damn good job.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

O.K. Sir.

DONALD AUSTIN

You've built…I'd like to say one thing…you've built one lemon already that doesn't work properly, why don't you go back and straighten out that before you ever go and build another one here in our back door. We don't need another plant like the first one you built. Then people aren't satisfied up there and until they are satisfied up there, you be able to build another one and make a bigger mess. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you. Is there anybody else? If there is no one else…oh I'm sorry…

DON FLATT

Good night, Sir. My name is Don Flatt. I've been involved with my wife (laughter)…of course I've been (laughter)…How bout I start again? (laughter) …She's in the back here.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

I'm sure she's glad to hear that (laughter)

DON FLATT

I just wanted to say a couple of things. I've met some of the members of the panel here and other representatives from NB Power in the room and I know you're all good guys and your trying to what's best to keep your job and save money and I know that you mean well…and your crunching all the numbers to make it work…but really you know, the…how much did you say you spent $300 million already? $30 million, so if you put scrubbers on the stacks right now, on the stack right now? How much would that cost? But if you did use them…like that would be twice that three times that?

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Are you looking for an answer to that right now…

DON FLATT

Yes, I'd like an answer to that question, you know.

GAETAN THOMAS

The scrubbers themselves and the new stack required for the scrubber and the new waste water treatment plant and you know, the NO_x controls will account to $436 million…you know of environmental control. The scrubbers, only scrubbers, which is only a small part of it, could be you know it's hard to piece out because it's a big patch between the … the scrubber is around $100 million for the scrubbers themselves.

DON FLATT

On the present plant? I thought you could just…if you built a new stack…you say you have to build a new stack… it would cost more than it would cost to go to a new fuel, to convert all your equipment to fuel Gaetan?

GAETAN THOMAS

The cost that was incorrectly referred to as $90,000, but was corrected by the Public Interest Group was closer to $90 million only dealt with low NOx equipment. And the low NOx controls you know would be in the vicinity of $30 + million and then there's other systems that need to be in place as well. So you know, it's a complicated question and I can show you all the details…

DON FLATT

I know it is and I know that…that's O.K. …thanks for trying to answer it and I know it's a complicated question and I appreciate…but I also know that you guys are familiar with alternative forms of energy. New Brunswick has an opportunity now to a leader in the world in creating a…you know there's windmills…we've done some research on the Internet too, a lot of people here have…you can get five megawatt powered windmills and stick them out in the Bay of Fundy for example…right like Elizabeth Weir said make them at Saint John Shipbuilding…you know give all these shipbuilders jobs, bring employment back to Saint John…there are so many opportunities here to do a good thing and we're blowing it by buying this crap and burning it and its just a shame.

You know my wife and I moved …my wife is from here ….she brought me here from Ontario….we moved here because our son was ill from environmental illnesses there. It broke our heart to come here and find that we're running into the same damn crap. You know we were in downtown Toronto and we had to move to Mississauga and then in Mississauga there was pollution there and now we're here and it's the same stuff….you know, you guys really could make a change…you know there's a chance here to make a good chance. (Clapping) It's a damn shame!

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you. I don't see anybody else at the microphones….Mr. Gillis wanted to make one final comment, a very specific comment I understand.

GREG GILLIS

To be very clear, there's been some comments made that we seem to have neglected

Musquash Estuary and that indeed is not accurate at all. In the conduct of this investigation, the Musquash Estuary was one of the areas that we identified as being very important. In the Comparative Environmental Risk Assessment, the way that Project was undertaken was that they had a serious of workshops in Saint John. To these workshops they invited people from the Eastern Charlotte Waterways Group, from the Saint John ACAP Group, DFO, other researchers, other university professors…a whole range of people to these workshops. They identified a number areas that were important and had been highlighted in the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment document. Included is Musquash Estuary, Harbour and all of the environment. They used as one of the reference documents a paper by Sing, which is a DFO technical publication which outlines very clearly the sensitivity of the Musquash Estuary, the importance of the Musquash Estuary and the fact that it's being considered….as David has pointed out, as a Marine Protected Area. That information has been presented in the Comparative Ecological Risk Assessment. It was forward to the full EIA document. On page 539 the Musquash Harbour is described. The VEC that was identified, the Valued Environmental Component was identified as the marine ecosystems referenced back to the Comparative Environmental Risk Assessment that was the Valued Environmental Component that we took forward. So indeed it was considered, the Musquash Estuary was considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment. The process involved in doing this, we made sure that we consulted with people. We did toxicity tests on some of the species that were identified in Musquash Harbour including cerophofium including other species were conducted so that we would have that data. I just wanted to clarify that.

DAVID THOMPSON

….in the main report. I have great difficulty I guess when things like for instance the area like the Red Head Marsh is talked about and named in the report; a very small area that's been damned up by Ducks Unlimited that isn't functioning anymore that has a sewage lagoon pouring into it that's surrounded by industrial development…an area of maybe 40 or 50 acres. And when the word Loch Alva Provincial Protected Area, which is a huge area and the Musquash Estuary, which has about 50 times as much salt marsh in it and 100 times…perhaps a few hundred times as much area in it as the Red Head Marsh and it isn't impacted by any of those things…when it isn't even mentioned or the Marine Protected Area in the main document of the report the one that the public sees…I mean there might be part of a report that you talked about with somebody.

But, the other thing that bothers me there is the very people that have been commissioning all the research there, particularly the Conservation Council of New Brunswick and our funders and supporters and the Musquash Marine Protected Area Planning Group and now the Friends of Musquash, which were specifically requested to set themselves up by both levels of Government weren't even consulted with. I see on the list the groups that were consulted with were communities of Quispamsis and that sort of thing. But, the particular group that's working for the ecological protection of the Musquash area and its membership from people of the community of Musquash and Lorneville weren't even consulted with. We weren't even worthy of being consulted with. There's nothing in this report. The word Marine Protected Area or Planned Protected Area is not mentioned in this report document.

And, you have our recommendation tonight…rather the recommendation I say...our recommendation in this case our recommendation from the Friends of Musquash and I'd just like to read that (inaudible voice in background)…and I'll just show you what needs to be done and what we expect to be the outcome from this meeting here right now.

The boundaries of the Environmental Impact Assessment study be extended to include the Musquash Estuary and Watershed and that the significance of the Musquash Estuary and Marine Protected Area program be fully documented and acknowledged in an additional section to be added to the Environmental Impact Assessment report. And I mean added to that main report, so we expect to see that binder in a few months with all that information added to it, naming the work and the reports all this that has been done….and so it…we have a very huge environmental area here …environmental protection that's just about to come into being. It hasn't been legislated, the Loch Alva Protected Area, but the government will legislate that in the fall and very likely the federal government in the next year or year and half will legislate the Marine Protected Area in Musquash. So we'll have the largest Marine Protected Area in the Province, larger than even the provincial parks and for you to ignore that in the Environmental Impact Assessment when you talk about something like the Red Head Marsh, it's just concealing the fact that that its sitting right next to your plant and the impact that your dump is going to have on that and the emissions from that plant into the air could have on both the Loch Alva Protected

Area and the Marine Protected Area. And we want to see that outline in the report fully. And I'm not asking you to do it, because you have no responsibility to the people of New Brunswick to protect their environment or to protect their health as I mentioned before…but, the Department of Environment does.

And I had mentioned this to Germaine Pataki-Theriault, in fact I approached her and gave her a letter, which I think she'll attest to at the time of Public Utility Board Hearings in Saint John. Is that not correct? Requesting that the matter of the potential impacts to the Marine Protected Area and the Loch Alva Protected Area be fully identified in the report. I asked that for the Terms of Reference. And, also the impact on the Right Whales in the Bay of Fundy. And, that letter was given to you then and I don't see that it's been done…I don't see it in the report. We want it in the report.

GERMAINE PATAKI-THÉRIAULT

Excuse me I want to verify that…I thought that was for the LNG facility that you had given me those comments at the Public Utility Board Hearing.

DAVID THOMPSON

It was this particular one…it was the Orimulsion® …..mentioned regarding the LNG about the Right Whale, obviously the LNG project would have no effect on the Marine Protected Area or Loch Alva, so I would not have asked that. But, I did ask about the ship traffic to the LNG facility in respect to the Right Whale and it hasn't been addressed in the Report and it needs to be and we want to see the report circulated to the public of this area with that information in it so they have a chance to…everyone has a chance to see it and digest it. So, that's the request. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Microphone #4, would you identify yourself again please?

ELSIE RUSTLING

I didn't intend to speak again, but I just had one more thing that I would like to say. We have a great heritage here in Lorneville and it seems that its being destroyed bit by bit. I would just like you to know how this Village started. I suppose everyone knows that people immigrated from Ireland during the Great Famine and many of them settled here in Lorneville. People died so fast on the ships that when they landed at Partridge Island, they could not build coffins for them. Those who survived were left destitute except for spades, hoes, axes and saws.

I'm just going to read you a little bit that was written by my Great Uncle George Reid, who immigrated as a child with his parents. This is what I have from here how Lorneville started. "Those survived took up small parcels of land bordering on the seashore of New Brunswick. There were many bits of land given to them by the British Colonels. The settlers had very little money left when they settled into Sirinkle, now Lorneville; but they had a goal and an abundance of ambition. They had little furniture. They felled trees and built log houses, hewing the timber on one side that would be the inside for walls. They ship sawed the boards for the roof. They did not edge the boards. They laid them top to butt and they chinked, or in other words corked the space left in between the logs with knots and plaster. They made the shingles for the roof from the white pine trees that grew very large in diameter. It was a very soft wood and split straight. They sawed the blocks two feet long and then they split the blocks into the size they wanted. They marked out the thickness of the shingle they needed. Standard thickness was one inch. White pine was a wood with a lot of turpentine in it and it did not chip or split with the weather. They also used it for building boats as it was light in weight and did not rot. The shingle nails were made by a blacksmith. Hand made and there was not one nail wasted. They worked in building groups and cleared the land the same way until they got little lots to build on and to raise some vegetables. Then they gradually cleared their land holdings. They worked while there was daylight and they were happy and they enjoyed working. Partridge Island Fog Whistle was the first steam whistle in the world. So that's what our ancestors did for us and we don't like to see it destroyed. And we want the environment to be protected.

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you Madame. You want to say something sir? Would you identify yourself.

GERRY POOLE

My name is Gerry Poole and I've been a resident for quite awhile. And I've been involved in fighting battles in this community for as long as I can remember and I don't want to remember any more of them. I've heard comments tonight about "state of the art"...well, here's "state of the art"...I mean I can remember a long time ago my father telling me about a state of the art system they were going to put in at the pulp mill when they were trying to get rid of the fumes down there. They were going to run a pipe from the centre of the plant underneath the water. And the comment that was made when by my dad at that time to the environment people: "If you ever lit a fart and it backed up." And the same technology that they used today was the same technology they used yesterday. Your "state of the art" system that you want to put in is the same state of the art you're putting up in Crane Mountain. The same that you're putting up in the dumps we have around now. It's ridiculous to think that we the people are going to sit back and let a committee of people destroy our community. I think that our environment people should put one other thing on their endangered species list, as an endangered commodity...which is the air we breath and the land that we walk on. I think we need to protect it more so than we need to protect NB Power's interest in this Orimulsion® they want to bring in. (Clapping)

EMERY GOGUEN (CHAIRPERSON)

Thank you sir. I guess I would like to thank everyone on behalf of the Minister of the Environment and Local Government for coming this evening to make your views known. Certainly important issues on behalf of the people have been presented and all will be passed on. Please remember that you have the opportunity to make additional comments in writing for a period of 15 days beginning today, which brings us to August 14th. You can use these forms if you wish or you can write your comments some other way. You can actually leave your forms with the staff this evening if you wish...that can be done. Before adjourning this meeting I want to remind you that if you got to pass on this tile floor, it has sweated quite a bit and it may be quite slippery. So again, I would like to thank you for coming. The meeting is adjourned.

11:38 P.M.

(END OF TAPE 4/SIDE 6)